612
596

Sarakatsani EH14

[For additional information on the Tséligato, an economic cooperative the nucleus of which consists of an extended family, see Category 474.]

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

[p. 36]

III

KINSMEN AND AFFINES

1. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF KINSMEN

6/2 THE kindred (τὸ σόϊ) includes only those blood kinsmen of a man (or woman)[1] who are formally recognized for social purposes. The Sarakatsani recognize as members of the kindred all cognatic relatives as far as the degree of second cousin, whether these links are traced through the father's or mother's side of the family. In this system, all those persons descended from a man's four grandparents and their brothers and sisters are his kinsmen, except the children of his second cousins, the grandchildren of his first cousins, and the great-grandchildren of his own siblings, who are not members of his kindred. To express this in more general terms, the recognition for social purposes of collateral relations is relatively wide in a man's own generation and subsequently becomes, from his point of view, relatively less wide in each descendant generation. As a man passes through life, critical events, such as his marriage and the birth of children, the marriages of these children and the birth of grandchildren, direct his obligations and interests to his own immediate descendants to the exclusion of collaterals.

[602]

6/2 59 Kindred relationships are considered by the Sarakatsani to be extensions from the family. Naturally, it is always a member of a man's elementary family who mediates his various relationships in the kindred, parents providing the links with grandparents, uncles, aunts, and cousins; siblings those with nephews and nieces. And although the kindred is a system of personal relationships while the family is a corporate group,[2] the systematic character of the former, and the structure of the latter, are necessarily interdependent and consistent.

[1] Except where there is ambiguity I shall not repeat this cumbersome qualification.

[2] Perpetuity is a quality often premised of corporate kinship groups, whereas Sarakatsan families are limited to a life of some 40 years, i.e. the period which normally elapses between a man's marriage and the division

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

The Sarakatsan family is not only a domestic association of individuals with mutual affections based on blood relationship, it is a corporate group owning in common all significant property; and of this the leader, whether father or brother, is the trustee not the owner. Economically it struggles to become a self-sufficient unit with a division of labour organized about the service of its flocks; politically its members invariably act together. The individual in his work and behaviour is entirely committed to his family, whose prestige and reputation for honour are his foremost concern.

The family is also a religious community with its own 'sacra', icons, and other objects. In the popular mind it is an earthly reflection of the Heavenly Family of God the Father, the Mother of God, and Christ. Relations between members of a family ought to be modelled on the attitudes which, it is imagined, inspire the relations of the Heavenly archetype Family and its members. A father ought to have wisdom and foresight, a mother compassion, a son courage and respect, a daughter virginity, and so on.[2] Through grace, which descends in the sacrament of the Eucharist and through the icons, and in other ways, they are helped to achieve these modes of being, and in achieving them they partake, in a sense, of the condition of the Holy Family and are therefore less vulnerable as a group to material disaster or the spiritual attacks of the Devil. Through reference to a divine model, a man or woman in family life participates in a reality that transcends individuality; the harsh and ceaseless struggle to survive, even simple and often repeated actions such as carrying water or milking sheep, come to possess a validity which is absolute and intrinsic.

of the joint household by his married sons. Yet so long as it does last, the family group has in other respects a corporate jural existence and personality. Cf. Sir Henry Maine, *The Early History of Institutions*, London, 1893, p. 78.

The Sarakatsan family is a system of closed relationships and a group with a recognized leader. It holds all property in common and controls the productive powers of all its members and the reproductive capacities of its women. In principle all its members are held to be responsible for the action of any other member. It is with regard to these characteristics that I describe this group as 'corporate'.

[2] In the different aspects of her person, the Mother of God provides a model for both the mother and the daughter in the earthly family.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

59
612 The family is, indeed, the centre of the shepherd's world. Inside its limits he finds support, affection, and a sense of moral obligation. With certain qualifications these attitudes are extended to all the relations of the kindred. But outside the family and the kindred a man meets and expects only hostility and suspicion. There are conventions of conduct, but there is no general conscience of obligation to others. From the point of view of each individual, the community is divided into those who are kinsmen, a man's own people (δικοί), and those who are not kinsmen, that is strangers (ξένοι). There is a third intermediate category of persons, the affines (συμπέθεροι), strangers with whom a man or his kinsman has become related through a contract of marriage. Confidence, trust, and an altruistic concern about another individual's welfare can only exist between kinsmen, and it is only in a kinship relationship that a man is able to abandon the outlook of self-interest which normally guides him in relations outside the family.

571 602 619 [612]

612 It follows that a man looks towards his kinsmen for practical support. As we have seen, unrelated families are mutually opposed. The family, with reference to which the individual must act in almost all contexts of behaviour, faces a hostile community. Therefore this support is peculiarly important. Yet, in relation to the community's population of about 4,000 souls, the average size of an individual's kindred is small, seldom exceeding 250 men, women, and children of whom some 160 will be second cousins, a category of relations who are on the margin of kinship. Kinsmen are relatively few and correspondingly precious. In summer the kindred is scattered over 390 square miles of difficult and tortuous country, and a man does not, generally, live within an hour's walk of more than one-fifth of his kinsmen. This, in part, is the practical importance of kinship connexions; they offer a certain freedom of social manœuvre. Kinsmen established at strategic points through a community, which is numerically not small and geographically very dispersed, are able to offer hospitality and local information which pride and distrust prevent a man asking of unrelated persons. The network of a man's kinship relations provides him with a system of information and intelligence without which he cannot conduct his affairs efficiently or profitably. The price that he should ask for his milk, his wool, and animals for

[578] [162] [203]

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

slaughter, the intrigues of others with merchants and officials, which often vitally affect his own affairs, the ever pressing problem of where winter pasture is to be found, this is the kind of information a man exchanges with his kinsman or, more rarely, with a close and trusted affine.

Kinsmen are indispensable in the delicate negotiations of 'match-making'. Before a girl is sought in marriage, very careful inquiries have to be made concerning her virtue, industry, health, and temperament. A kinsman who lives near the girl's family will be in a position to give accurate details; his information will be trusted, and he will treat the affair with the discretion it demands. For marriage involves a contract between two hostile groups, and offence, given or received by either side, is a question of honour and may lead to violence and killing.

I have introduced the notion that the opposed families of this fragmented community are related through competition for prestige. Certainly, it is impossible to miss the competitive flavour of social life outside the home. Men care passionately about their prestige, the prestige of their families, and of their kinsmen. Indeed all these reputations are parts of a single complex. And in a paradoxical fashion they depend upon the opinions of enemies. Whenever there is some incident or affray, the news of it travels with remarkable rapidity to all quarters of the Zagori. Within a matter of forty-eight hours small groups of Sarakatsani throughout the area will be passing judgement on the behaviour of the people involved, as this is evaluated according to the values of the community. They will analyse minutely what a man is reported to have said and done, and they will decide whether he was justified in what he did and whether he displayed manliness (ἀνδρισμός) in defending his honour. In such discussions a man's kinsmen will take his side, acting as advocates and apologists for his behaviour. Furthermore, the mere numerical size of a man's kindred is a matter of prestige, because, other things being equal, it means that he is a man who will be taken notice of, assisted, and well-informed wherever he goes. In discussing kinship the Sarakatsani often say, 'Nobody takes account of a man without kinsmen'. They use, in this context, a word, λογαριάζω, which expresses both the idea of esteeming another man and of

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

612 829 being obliged to take him into consideration before proceeding to some course of action.

612 Consultation between trusted kinsmen about their various affairs is continual. The enterprise itself may be of almost any kind, the marriage of a son or daughter, a decision whether or not to sell sheep to raise money for the payment of a debt, or the acceptance or non-acceptance of an offer of winter pasture. Similarly, when a man is involved in some crisis, a fight with another shepherd, a brawl at a marriage feast, or a difficult court case, kinsmen come to him of their own accord with advice and criticism. In this way he learns which courses of action will enjoy the moral support of his kin and which will not. And since a man loses prestige if his kinsman acts wrongly, he will always exhort him to an honourable course of action however difficult the circumstances. For his part, the principal actor is influenced by the fear of losing the support of his kinsmen, as he may do if he takes decisions which lose him prestige. His kinsmen can then only protect their own prestige by isolating themselves to a greater or lesser degree from social contact with him. Consequently this consultation between kinsmen is not only to a man's advantage in terms of his own prestige, but it is also a subtle sanction for right ways of acting in the community as a whole.

612 558 [626]

612 In economic matters, too, a shepherd looks to his kinsmen for help and co-operation. Quite apart from the deep distrust which divides unrelated persons, shame prevents a man from seeking assistance outside the kindred, since this would be a tacit admission that he had been rejected by his own kinsmen. Thus sentiment and convention lead in the same direction. A shepherd lives from one monetary crisis to another. When he needs a small money loan for an operation fee at a Jannina hospital or for the expenses of a wedding, he is often unable to persuade a merchant to grant him an additional advance; but he seldom fails to raise it from his kinsmen if they have the money in hand. Economic co-operation may take other forms. The condition of the family's flocks is not only the basis of its physical existence but the source of pride and prestige. A man fears to meet the appraising eyes of another if his animals are in a meagre and spindle-shanked condition. But grazing, both in the Zagori and in the winter pastures, varies considerably from

476 [426]

612 476 233

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

place to place and from year to year. Therefore, if a kinsman has some grass which is good for fattening lambs or restoring weakened ewes, a man may ask him to take some of his weaker animals which are in difficulties. For this service he will have to pay, but he would not in any circumstances trust his sheep to the care of an unrelated shepherd.

But the most intimate form of economic association between kinsmen occurs where a number of autonomous but related families join together for the co-management of their flocks and, in particular, to discover and negotiate for winter pastures. The solution of this problem requires that the group should reach an understanding, whether direct or through an intermediary, with persons of influence in villages and government departments. The leader of such a 'company' is known as the tselingas (ὁ τσέλιγγας). In a majority of cases the nucleus of the group he leads may be descibed as a simple fraternal association, that is a number of married brothers with families, each of whom maintains his own household, his own purse, and has his own animals clearly marked. But, in addition, such groups often include uncles, nephews, brothers-in-law, paternal and maternal cousins, and it would be possible to produce many examples of different combinations of kinsmen and affinal relatives. At this point, it is sufficient to stress that they are founded upon ties of kinship and marriage, that they are voluntary and often unstable associations in which each family retains its own independent social personality, its own budget, and its own animals.

In these ways kinsmen give each other moral and practical support in facing a hostile and competitive world where one man delights openly and with little inhibition in the misfortunes of another. A man co-operates with his kinsmen because he trusts them. There is a sense of security within the kindred which is significantly absent outside its limits. One may not steal from a kinsman's flock, nor cheat him in monetary settlements, nor seduce his sister, nor gossip about his private affairs. But it is necessary to stress that there are definite limits to what may be expected from kinsmen. When honour demands a vengeance killing, kinsmen outside the family will lend moral support but none of them is obliged to pull the trigger or thrust home the knife. Again, money may be loaned between kinsmen

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

Again, money may be loaned between kinsmen
612 [426] but repayment after a reasonable interval is expected, and in almost all cases is met, even where it leads to the sale of sheep. It amounts to this, that a man will help his kinsman and indeed is morally obliged to do so, so long as this assistance does not conflict with the interests of his own family.

2. THE KINDRED

[611] The kindred of the Sarakatsani has three important formal characteristics. It is bilateral, the limits of its extension are precisely defined, and within these limits a man may not marry.

There is a sense in which almost all kinship systems may be described as bilateral, or to speak more accurately, filiation is normally bilateral and complementary.[4] But in describing the Sarakatsan kindred as bilateral it is my intention also to suggest a certain, though not exact, symmetry in the relations of a man to the family of origin[5] of his father on the one hand, and to the family of origin of his mother on the other; and to indicate further that, in principle, a man has equivalent confidence in, and similar rights over and obligations towards, more distant collateral kinsmen such as first or second cousins, whether the relationships with these persons are traced through the father or through the mother.[6] There is always a very strong moral obligation to assist any collateral kinsman. For instance, it often

[113] [4] Meyer Fortes, 'Structure of Unilineal Descent Groups', *American Anthropologist*, 1953, vol. 55, p. 33.

[5] This is Lloyd Warner's familiar distinction between the family of orientation and the family of procreation. I prefer the terms 'origin' and 'marriage'; in the family of origin the individual is a child and a sibling, in the family of marriage a spouse and a parent.

[601] [6] The bilateral form of the kindred is plainly reflected in the terminology. The word σόϊ, kindred, applies, of course, to both maternal and paternal relations; and the words for kinsman συγγενής and relationship συγγένεια are both used in the same way. The terms which are used to describe kinship relationship outside the family do not differentiate between maternal and paternal kinsmen. Thus the term θείος, uncle, is used for both mother's brother and father's brother as well as for all male first cousins of both parents whether these are connected through male or female links. The same may be said about the other terms for παπποῦλης, grandfather, γιάγια, grandmother, θεία, aunt, ἐξάδερφος, ἐξαδέρφη, male and female cousin, ἀνεψιός, ἀνεψιά, nephew and niece, and ἐγγόνι, ἐγγονή, grandchild, grand-daughter.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

happens at weddings that quarrels develop between unrelated guests. Insults, curses, and blows are exchanged, and sometimes knives are drawn. These events have a certain pattern. A man is insulted, or imagines that he has been insulted, by another. At once all the relatives of either man range themselves alongside their kinsman; and those who are unrelated to either party, as well as others embarrassed by an equal allegiance to both sides, throw themselves between the two antagonists. But the paternal or maternal origin of relationship neither increases nor diminishes the obligation to support a kinsman in this or any other situation.

Property and prestige are passed from one generation to the next according to customary rules of inheritance in the one case, and canons of popular judgement in the other, which reflect the symmetry of an individual's relations to the families of origin of his father and mother. Property is itself an element in prestige, while wealth without prestige loses its significance. Individual and family reputation, as I have already indicated, is a self-evident value; without it social life has no meaning. This prestige is inherited both from the father's family and the mother's. It is true that the prestige of paternal connexions is greater; but the quality of the mother's family of origin is also critical, for criticism of the mother, who contributes important moral qualities to the characters of her children, is a peculiarly effective method of denigrating a family. The individual, of course, may increase or diminish his reputation by his own acts but it is on the basis of a reputation inherited from both parents that he at first faces the judgements of the community. And if this inherited reputation is unsatisfactory, it will be exceedingly difficult for the individual by his own efforts to redeem it. It is partly for these reasons that the choice of a wife is a matter which is approached with delicacy and deliberation. Many personal qualities of a prospective bride are taken into consideration but invariably the crucial question to be debated is the quality and prestige of the girl's family and close kin. The Sarakatsani use a Turkish word, ντιμάρι, of which the primary meaning is a vein, to indicate the general quality of a man's immediate maternal and paternal ancestors.[1] And if either the

[1] The more general meaning of ντιμάρι in modern Greek is 'stone quarry'.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

bride or the bridegroom is from a family of lower prestige than the other, it is said that he (or she) 'destroys' the *ντιμάρι* of the other partner. For it is thought that in the family which results from a marriage both partners have contributed their blood 'to make one blood' which is unique and on whose purity the prestige and honour of the new family depends.

In a similar manner both husband and wife contribute wealth to the elementary family which they establish. The corporate property of a family is a common stock of animals, money, and goods, from which sons and daughters must be endowed. Daughters receive their portion as dowry at the moment of marriage, but the married sons normally continue to live in an extended family group where family wealth is still held in common. In the eventual partition of this joint household and its property, which is delayed until all the daughters have been married, and generally occurs five to ten years after the marriage of the eldest son, equal shares of stock and other assets are received by each son; but in the case of the youngest son an extra half-share is provided for the maintenance of each surviving parent who by custom remains in the household of this son. When an elementary family leaves the joint household of married brothers, the husband's family has probably contributed about 100 sheep and goats and one or two mules while the wife's family has supplied in the form of her dowry (*προυκιό*) the furnishings of the hut and sufficient clothes and finery for the bride to wear or display for a period of ten years or more. The value of such a dowry is about £150, or the equivalent of 50 sheep. Since 1945, however, the practice has grown up of demanding from the bride's family about forty sheep or their equivalent in gold sovereigns in addition to the traditional dowry. Thus approximately under the traditional convention, and more rigorously today, there exists a certain balance between the wealth that passes into a new family from the husband's family of origin and that which is contributed by the wife's family of origin. It would be wrong to think of the dowry merely as a payment made by a bride's family to obtain a husband for her. Certainly there have been cases where girls who had physical or moral deficiencies have had to pay large dowries to get any kind of husband at all. It is also true that calculations of family prestige are concerned in the size of the

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

827 828 shirts to shreds when he dances at weddings. This odd behaviour is not approved, but in terms of χοόt it may, at least, be explained; and it is remembered that his mother's brother, although he did not tear his shirts, used to waste his substance in another way by gambling at cards for high stakes, which he could not afford.

59 612 It is clear, then, that the elements of wealth, prestige, and character pass into a family from both the families which enter into the original betrothal contract. This not only reflects the bilateral and symmetrical form of the kindred but in some measure helps to maintain it. For, if a man has contracted a judicious marriage with a girl from a family of at least equivalent prestige, the children will be anxious to associate with their matrilateral kin. On the other hand, it is noticeable that where a man has married into a family of lower prestige than his own (that is, where prestige has not been equally inherited from both sides), his children tend to evade obligations to their mother's kinsmen while they carefully cultivate kinsmen of the father. However, if a wife brings a substantial dowry (that is, where a newly established family is equally endowed with wealth from both sides), the husband is obliged to be particularly helpful to the family and kinsmen of his wife, and this leads to close relations between his children and their maternal cousins.

612 The bilateral structure of the kindred implies, of course, that this association of kinsmen is not a corporate group. Its definition must always be relative to a particular group of siblings.[1] At a wedding, when representatives of all sections of the bridegroom's kindred gather round him in support against the kindred of the bride, the illusion is created that two solidary corporate groups of kinsmen are involved. But in fact they are only united in the particular context of the wedding and by reason of each individual's personal kinship relation to the bridegroom. Indeed since any particular kindred comprises descendants of four pairs of unrelated great-grandparents, only the sibling group which is central to this kindred is related to all

[113] [1] This has long been recognized. See Bertha Phillpotts, *Kindred and Clan*, Cambridge, 1913, pp. 3, 275. However, it should be clear that corporate associations of kinsmen may exist in this kind of community. But other criteria will be involved, not merely kinship relationship.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

its members.[9] It is only through the marriages of their grandparents and parents that a man and his siblings are related to the four component groups of collaterals in his kindred. Kindred relations are personal, not corporate, relations. And the Sarakatsan kindred in no way acts as a property-holding group since, besides the fact that it is relative to a particular sibling group, it has no continuity from generation to generation.

In drawing attention to this bilateral and symmetrical form of the kindred I have been careful to avoid speaking of bilateral descent. In anthropological writings principles of descent normally refer to rules which determine membership in corporate lineal descent groups. Such groups are bodies of kinsmen whose members may be recruited through filiation to a line of descent exclusively through males (patrilineal), or exclusively through females (matrilineal).[10] Descent from a common ancestor or group of ancestors defines membership in the group and identifies the interests of its members, which may concern political and ritual rights and obligations as well as inheritance and succession. It is possible to talk of a corporate bilateral descent group where membership depends upon filiation through both parents but in such an instance the group would have to practise obligatory endogamous marriage. But the Sarakatsan kindred is not an endogamous group. Corporate descent groups imply a principle of perpetual succession, a feature which the kindred entirely lacks; and they also imply that individuals have categorical rights and obligations outside the elementary or extended family, whereas in the Sarakatsan kindred this is not so. Not descent, but filiation of a man or woman to his or her family of origin is the factor which

[9] Any two kinsmen other than siblings have kindreds which to a greater or lesser degree overlap. A man may find himself in a situation where two men, both related to him but unrelated to one another, are in some form of conflict in which both appeal to him for support. In this predicament the only solution is to remain neutral, since it would be sinful to act against a kinsman except under great provocation. But generally such a situation extends rather than restricts the range of kinship obligations; towards a person who, although not a kinsman himself, is closely related to a kinsman, a man ought to act with more consideration and less hostility than is usual between men who are unrelated.

[10] There are other possibilities, viz. bilineal or dual descent, parallel descent, and alternating descent.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

determines status, categorical rights and obligations, and membership in the family group, which is the only solidary kin grouping in this system of kinship and marriage. Hence in a description of the Sarakatsan kindred it seems preferable not to speak, even loosely, of any principle of descent.[11]

It is true that the kindred of any man includes the descendants of four pairs of great-grandparents. It is, therefore, possible to represent the kindred diagrammatically as four interlocking pyramids of cognatic descent. But this kind of abstraction bears no relation to the mental image which a Sarakatsanos forms of his kindred, in which relations are conceived in terms of extension from the family of origin, not descent from a common ancestor. There is mutual affection and moral obligation between my second cousin and myself because my grandparent and his grandparent were siblings rather than because we are both descendants of common great-grandparents. I prefer, then, to speak of equivalent bilateral extension, for this describes precisely the constitution of the kindred. The qualification of bilateral extension by the notion of equivalence is intended to underline both the fact that collateral kinsmen are recognized to the degree of second cousin on either side of the family, and also the equipotential character of matrilateral and patrilateral relationships.

The second formal characteristic of the kindred is the definition of its limits, which, in this case, are drawn in a man's own generation at the collateral degree of second cousin, a span of collateral kinship which is calculated by recognizing as kinsmen the descendants of his four grandparents and their siblings. Thereafter, as we have seen, the recognition of collaterals is increasingly restricted in descendant generations. This limitation, considered together with equivalent bilateral extension, leads to a simple process within the kindred whereby the range of collateral relationship which a child may inherit from either parent is severely delimited. The second cousins of his parent are not, in a formal sense, a man's kinsmen and, therefore, he may marry a kinswoman of this degree.

[11] In some general remarks about the concept of descent in bilateral systems Professor Firth has adopted a similar viewpoint. Raymond Firth (editor), *Two Studies of Kinship in London*, London, 1956, p. 15. Cf. also W. H. R. Rivers, *Social Organisation*, London, 1924, p. 86, and G. P. Murdock, *Social Structure*, New York, 1949, p. 15.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

may marry a kinswoman of this degree. In other words, the children of a marriage throw away, as it were, perhaps three-quarters[18] of those kinsmen who are recognized collateral relations of the parents. The father, when he identifies himself with the interests of his own children, at once creates a certain kinship distance between himself and any one of his own siblings, the kindred of whose children only partly coincides with the kindred of his own children. Since the descendants of the father's second cousins are no longer kinsmen of his children, they also cease to be significant for him and are not recognized as kinsmen; similarly in the case of the grandchildren of first cousins, and the great-grandchildren of siblings. And the same considerations apply in the case of the mother and her collateral kin. With the passage of time parents turn their loyalty and interest from the collateral kinsmen of their own generation to their direct descendants and to only those collateral descendants who remain relevant for their own descendants; these are necessarily fewer in each descendant generation.

From one point of view a man's kinsmen are the descendants of the four sibling groups of his two grandfathers and two grandmothers. Sarakatsan kinship finds its source in the unity of the sibling group born and nurtured within a legitimate family. Collateral kinsmen see themselves as the descendants of such a group and it is this sentiment which provides the basis of the personal moral solidarity with a kinsman. Thus the Greek word for cousins (ἐξάδερφοι) means literally 'from brothers'. But Sarakatsani are, also, conscious that it is through marriages in which the interests of siblings or cousins cannot be mutually identified that kinsmen become separated. For a man is related more closely to a particular kinsman than to the kinsman's child; thus, with the close identification of a father's interests with those of his children and the exclusive concentration of categorical obligations in the family of marriage, the marriages of collaterals inevitably lead to change and a measure of disintegration in the individual's kindred. In a phrase, marriage joins strangers while it separates those who are already kinsmen. The consequences for the children and grandchildren of siblings are that a man has approximately only half his kindred

[18] The exact size of this fraction depends upon the size of the various sibling groups in the kindreds.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

612 58 in common with his first cousin and only one quarter in common with his second cousin. It shows with what rapidity in this kinship system the common interests of the descendants of a sibling group disappear. With the passage of only three generations these descendants are formally unrelated and there is no restriction on the marriage of third cousins. A man says of this third cousin, 'The kindred has left the house' (βγῆκε τὸ σόϊ ἀπὸ τὸ σπίτι).

612 582 591 The third formal characteristic of the kindred is that a man may not marry within its limits. This means that the two families who form a marriage alliance are unrelated[13] and that the kindred of the groom will not considerably overlap with the kindred of the bride although they may claim some kinsmen in common. A kindred in which maternal and paternal kinsmen normally form mutually exclusive categories naturally has a wider span than a kindred in which these categories overlap; and to that extent, the marriage prohibition is consistent with the need to have many kinsmen in many places.

We have seen that the principle of equivalent bilateral extension together with the defined limits of the kindred acts over a period of time to force collaterals apart. A second consequence of the prohibition on marriage in the kindred is that it makes it impossible to counteract this process by confirming in a later generation a relationship which has already been established. Thus the practice of either first- or second-cousin marriage such as is reported from Spain by Pitt-Rivers,[14] where it is favoured as a means of conserving property within the family, is not possible among the Sarakatsani. This leads to a third consequence of the marriage prohibition. It forces a man who wishes to marry off his son or daughter to face, as it were, outwards from his kindred towards the total community. Thus while non-kinsmen are rivals and even enemies, they are also in a sense potential affines. This is peculiarly significant in a community where men unrelated by kinship are associated mainly through institutionalized forms of hostility and rivalry. A contract of marriage is normally the only instrument which may bring two unrelated families into positive association and co-operation. Indeed, a sense of the community's endogamy is an important

[13] Except in the cases of marriage between third cousins.

[113] [14] J. A. Pitt-Rivers, *The People of the Sierra*, London, 1954, pp. 103–6.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

element in their consciousness of being a community at all. Sarakatsani, when they wish to stress their solidarity in opposition to villagers or other outsiders, often claim that, if full records of their marriages had been preserved through the generations, it would be clear that they are all kinsmen, although they are quick to add the qualification that such kinship has long ago 'left the house'. The same principles of kinship extension and marriage prohibition which from the point of view of the individual tend towards the loosening of his relations with collaterals within the kindred, at the same time lead to a measure of cohesion within the community considered as a system of actual and potential kinship relations. Kin and non-kin, actual relations and potential relations, are opposed but also complementary categories.

Of these three formal features of the Sarakatsan kindred the dominant is, without doubt, equivalent bilateral extension. The distinctive consequence of this principle is that the only possible corporate group based upon kinship alone which can exist in such a system over a period of time as long as a generation is the elementary family. For since there is no unilineal principle of descent grouping, there can be no corporate kinship group of higher order, which either includes the elementary family, or cuts across it by including some of its members and excluding others. Nor are there non-unilineal corporate kin groups in which membership is based on optional or alternate filiation or on the choice of residence after marriage.[1] Such arrangements would conflict with the symmetrical affiliation of Sarakatsani to all kinsmen through all lines and the equivalence of obligation to all kinsmen of the same degree. Although the association of an elementary family, for the first five to ten years of its existence, with the husband's extended family of origin may obscure the situation, the newly established elementary family is influenced by both the families of origin of the husband and wife.

An interesting recognition of this occurs on the very day of marriage when in other respects the bride's family feel that they

[1] For a review of non-unilineal descent groups, see William Davenport, 'Nonunilinear Descent and Descent Groups', *American Anthropologist*, 1959, vol. 61, pp. 557–72. Cf. also J. D. Freeman, 'The Family System of the Iban of Borneo', *Cambridge Papers in Social Anthropology No. 1*, Cambridge, 1958.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

612 have been defeated and plundered. The Greek Orthodox
594 marriage service is in two parts, the first being the rite of
585 Betrothal (ἀρραβῶνας), the second the rite of 'Crowning' (στεφάνωσις); and normally they are celebrated in church as one ceremony. The Sarakatsani, however, bring a priest to the huts of the bride's family to perform the religious betrothal ceremony which the shepherds name 'the half wedding' (ὁ μισὸς γάμος), and consider to be equal in importance to the office of 'Crowning'. The bride's kinsmen will not surrender her to the groom's retinue until this ceremony is performed, and equally the marriage ceremony cannot be completed until the bride is brought to the home of the bridegroom. In effect, each side celebrates half the marriage service.

594 This double attraction is eventually resolved by the new
612 family's relative emancipation from both the old families. Once the young family has parted from the husband's extended family of origin, it stands on its own without categorical rights over, or obligations towards, other related elementary families. It neither gives nor receives unconditional support of the kind that involves physical violence or economic assistance. In these important respects the family, even within the kindreds of its members, is, in a sense, isolated.

[601] This isolation of the elementary family is accurately reflected by the kinship terminology, although in this respect it does not differ from the general form of European kinship terminologies. It is significant that the terms for the kinship personalities in a man's elementary families of origin and marriage, that is in his inner circle of kinship, are not extended to more distant kinsmen as is the case in many societies with systems of unilineal descent. The family (οἰκογένεια) which may refer, according to context, to either or both elementary families in which the individual has or had corporate membership, and to any surviving grandparents, is part of the kindred, yet at the same time is clearly distinguished from it. In its widest connotation the 'family' is, of course, a class of relations and not a residential group. The principles which essentially relate members of the family are parental obligation and filiation, while the kindred is based on collateral extension. Between these two classes of kinsmen siblings are the bridge, since at the same time they are directly descended from the same parents and grandparents and

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

occupy, before marriage, a socially equivalent status, but become, after their marriages, the points of departure of distinct collateral lines of descent.

At the beginning of this chapter I described the multiform character of the family. It is a domestic group, an economic and property-owning unit, a quasi-political association, a religious communion, and so on. It is now evident that the elementary family group is the only stable solidary unit associated with the kindred and that while it enjoys important support from collateral kinsmen, it is also, in a sense, isolated from them. The immense importance, then, of this social group on the one hand, and its lack of continuity through time on the other, mean that the institutionalized arrangements for its establishment or dissolution, for the transference of categorical rights and obligations from an old family to a new, are of critical importance. Underlying the nature of these arrangements is the simple fact that each individual during some part of his lifetime is almost always the member of two families: one of origin, the other of marriage.[16] A man is a son and brother in one family, a father and husband in the other; a woman is a daughter and sister in the family of origin, a mother and wife in the family of marriage. It is obviously important that the rights and duties of these different roles, when played by the same individual, should not conflict. This is a problem for all systems of kinship, but it is especially acute in this community because all the individual's significant rights and obligations inhere in the family and in no other group. The individual passes from his first family to his second through marriage. In the case of the woman the solution of the problem of conflicting roles is radical; she leaves the home of her father, who ceases to have any rights over her except the residual right of resuming his power over her if she becomes a widow before the birth of children. The protection of her honour is no longer the concern of her brothers, and her working services now belong exclusively to the husband's family. When later she pays one of her rare visits to her original home, she may not spin even a handful of her mother's wool. The husband does not shed the categorical obligations of his roles as son

[16] An individual may have membership in a third family; for the grandparents, after the division of the joint household, normally live as members of the family of marriage of their youngest son.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

siblings and collaterals the two principles are opposed, sibling solidarity being the source and justification of relationship and moral obligation between collaterals, while parental obligation is the principle which, within the limits of a bilateral kindred, isolates the family from other kinsmen and their families. At the risk of some repetition, and in summary form, the critical aspects of these relationships are: (1) before marriage siblings are bound to one another by categorical obligations; (2) after marriage, the purpose of which is the begetting of children, this nexus is gradually dissolved; (3) after marriage the supreme value in a man's life becomes the welfare of his children; (4) parenthood forces a man for the sake of his children to cultivate his affines; this weakens to some extent the relationship with his siblings; (5) brothers after living together for a few years after marriage as a united extended family divide the common flock and the common household; after partition brothers generally continue to co-operate in the management of their sheep, but on a basis of strict accountancy; (6) collateral kinship is conceived by the Sarakatsani themselves as an extension from the family of origin which relates kinsmen to an original pair of siblings; thus collaterals see themselves as united by derivation from a once united sibling group but divided as a result of the marriages contracted by the members of that group and their children.

I must now introduce a consideration which to some small extent qualifies the symmetry which I have claimed to be a feature of the bilateral kindred. The absence of a unilineal principle of descent grouping does not prevent the Sarakatsani from having a very strong sentimental interest in their patriline and a formal preference for those kinsmen who are related through the father, especially those who bear the same name. The cousins with whom a man often shares his early childhood years in an extended family are agnatic cousins. And while the obligation to carry out blood vengeance does not extend beyond the elementary family, it is significant that when a man voluntarily avenges a kinsman beyond this narrow circle it is almost always an agnatic first cousin. Yet it must be said again that outside the elementary family moral obligations to kinsmen of the same collateral degree are the same however the relationship is mediated. The man, who states categorically that 'we

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

prefer relatives through the father', may name a maternal cousin as his most trusted friend.

When a Sarakatsanos talks loosely of his 'fathers and forefathers', he is probably thinking of a vague body of ancestors in the agnatic line. But in fact a man seldom knows very much about his direct ancestors in any line beyond the generation of his grandparents unless they have some claim to particular fame or infamy. Ascendant kinsmen are only relevant as individual personalities to the extent that they affect the inheritance of physical and moral attributes and social prestige. And it is the families of origin of the man's parents, presided over by his four grandparents, which essentially affect his social standing. The lines of descent from the two pairs of grandparents are the kinship co-ordinates, as it were, which intersect and define the unique position of a group of siblings within the community. Naturally the preference for the kinsmen of the father implies that in this evaluation the qualities of paternal kin have more weight, but this is not to be confused with the presence of a patrilineal descent principle.

A man is more interested in his sons than in his daughters simply because they are males and not because they are specifically agnatic links ensuring continuity in an exclusively agnatic descent line. It is important to a man to beget male children because in so doing he accentuates his own masculinity, extended in time. A man wants sons 'so that his name will be heard' (νὰ ἀκούεται τ'ὄνομά του), not simply the surname which is inherited patrilineally, but for it to be said that this is George Carvounis son of John Carvounis. Sons bring prestige, daughters do not. When the husband enters the hut for the first time after the birth of a daughter, his wife turns her head away and lowers her eyes in shame.

This formal preference for the father's kinsmen is consistent with, and indeed is, in the area of kinship, a reflection of the greater value placed upon the male sex. This is a fundamental value of Greek culture, whose essential masculinity can be remarked at all stages in its development from Homeric times until the present day. Thus, in the Sarakatsan community it is the behaviour of the ideal man that provides the dominant value patterns of honour and pride. The sexes divide the community into opposite yet complementary categories, categories

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

vengeance killing even if it concerns the death of a brother or the dishonour of a sister. Under the conditions of social life in a patrilocal extended family it is inevitable that there will be some conflict between a man's roles as son and brother in his family of origin and his roles as husband and father in his family of marriage. In important matters the Sarakatsani solve this problem by holding to the principle that obligations to direct lineal descendants always take priority over obligations to either direct ascendant or collateral kin. It is, then, not marriage but the birth of children which breaches the unity of the group of brothers.

The Sarakatsani claim that brothers would undoubtedly live together all their lives were it not for the quarrels of their wives. This is a rather too simple explanation of the causes which eventually lead to the separation of brothers; yet it is true that the differences between wives often provide the occasions for separation. There are two proverbs which the Sarakatsani often quote when discussing this subject. 'Women make the house and they destroy it' (οἱ γυναῖκες φκιάνουν τὸ σπίτι καὶ τὸ χαλᾶν). 'Wives are like nuts from forty different walnut trees' (ἀπὸ σαράντα καρυδιὲς καρύδια). The second proverb implies that wives are all alike, yet each comes from a different home. 'Each wife', said one informant, 'has her own mother. They cannot come to an understanding.' The Sarakatsani expect the wives of brothers to quarrel and on the whole they are not disappointed in their expectations. Yet, fundamentally, the growing distance between brothers is due to the obligations and affections which they owe to their children and which replace their former attachment to the sibling group. Quarrels between wives are not simply the result of incompatibility of temperament or some innate Greek sense of individuality. They arise because wives identify themselves with the rights and interests of their children. That this exclusive identification occurs, follows from the logic of the kinship system based on equivalent bilateral extension. As we have seen, the elementary family is the only corporate kinship group which is relatively enduring in this bilateral system. The children of each brother have in common with their cousins only half of their kindred. Through their affiliation to the kinsmen of their mother, they have certain affective interests and moral obligations they cannot share with their cousins.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

In describing the process of development which occurs within and between the elementary family of marriage and the extended family of origin, it has been possible to document a number of statements about kinship relations which were presented rather more formally in the previous chapter. During this review, a constant theme has been the inherent conflict between the sibling bond and the conjugal relation. It becomes clear that the conjugal relationship only takes priority over the long established relations between siblings after the birth of children; and this is because, in the Sarakatsan view, the obligations of parents towards their children possess an absolute and sacred quality. Indeed, it is the conflict between the individual's roles in his families of origin and of marriage which provide the key to the understanding of Sarakatsan kinship usages. The individual's withdrawal after marriage from categorical obligations to the other members of the sibling group marks the isolation of the family of marriage; and the increasing kinship distance which separates the husband or wife from brothers and sisters and other collateral kinsmen. And these processes are consistently related to the bilateral form of the kindred and the prohibition on marriage within its limits.

It is also apparent that the processes we have been discussing are not unaffected by the dominantly competitive values of the community. We have seen how the belief that a married man with a family ought to be master in his own household so that he may assert the interests of his own elementary family of marriage, influences the decision of a brother to set up his own household. It is not merely a question of material interest. Prestige is also involved. This is clear in the case of the eldest son, who puts pressure on his father to hand over the administration of family affairs. For in this instance there is no immediate fission of the unit into two or more parts, merely a redistribution of roles. The assumption of the status of head of household is in itself a matter of prestige. It makes a man in principle the equal, in that particular respect, of all the other heads of household in the community, and enables him to compete with them in all those situations where the prize is approval of a man's conduct and ability as worthy of the ideal type family protector. Therefore, in so far as the absolute quality of the parental obligation is institutionalized in the kinship system in the separation of brothers' households, the kinship system is consistent

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

V

COLLATERAL KINSMEN

1. FAVOURS AND OBLIGATIONS

THE Sarakatsani assume that ill-faith, doubt, and suspicion characterize the relations of men who are not kinsmen. In contrast, they think that the values and attitudes which make possible the communion of kinsmen are expressed in the meaning of ἐμπιστοσύνη, faith, trust, confidence; or πίστη, faith, belief. It is, then, not surprising that unrelated men very rarely co-operate in the management of their sheep or in any other venture; except, necessarily, the marriages of their children.

The rights and obligations of kinship are of a general and diffuse kind, not restricted to specific situations. A man is confident that a kinsman will keep a secret. He opens his mind to him freely because he knows he will use discretion in what he should pass on and what he must not. He believes the information that a kinsman gives to him, and he uses it as a basis for action without the fear of a lie or a trap. He is confident that when his own conduct is being evaluated by the community his kinsmen will support his case; and for his part he will not suffer in silence the public criticism of any of his kin. Above all, he feels secure and confident that when he is in difficulty there will be people who care for his interests and will give him assistance. These sentiments of confidence and trust are prescribed and follow from the simple existence of the kin relationship; they do not depend on the history of a gradually developing intimacy.

When a Sarakatsanos receives a favour from another, he must show gratitude. 'One good turn deserves another' (ἡ χάρη θέλει ἀντίχαρη). Even if only between the acceptance of some service and its later repayment, gratitude must for a while act as a makeweight in the balance. Not to show gratitude for help, which has been freely given, is behaviour open to severe public reproach. But to be grateful is to be 'obliged' (ὑποχρεωμένος); and this is an admission of inequality and even of weakness. The rare attempts at co-operation between unrelated persons have invariably ended in accusations and counter accusations that one man has done more for the other who, in return, has

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

609 578 [558] not shown the right attitude of a man under obligation. This, in a sense, is true. For neither side can admit to obligation without losing prestige; and both must attempt to claim the superordinate position in a creditor-debtor relationship.

• 612 But a man does not feel any embarrassment in asking for help from a kinsman. In these circumstances there is no shame in being under obligation or a debt of gratitude. Irrespective of the state of the balance of favours and counter favours, collateral relatives of the same generation, by reason of their kinship, are conceptually equal since they are descended from a pair of siblings who, before marriage and apart from the chances of [554] age and sex, were socially equivalent persons. A man does not lose prestige through obligation to a kinsman; on the contrary his reputation is increased, for the community pays attention to a person whose kinsmen lend him immediate and effective support. And for the man who gives aid to his kin, the knowledge that men learn of his actions through the gratitude of the kinsman who receives it, is sufficient recompense. For in this way he wins a reputation as a man of honour 'who supports his kinsmen'. If through wealth or influence a man is in a position to act as a general protector of his kindred, not only is he expected to do so, but this, in most cases, is also his wish. There is some altruism here. A man takes pleasure in the company of his kinsman; he finds him on occasion a source of practical advantage, but in particular he holds to him and has confidence in him simply because he is a kinsman. And for these reasons complaints of ingratitude against kinsmen are relatively few.

612 627 But although a man is under a moral obligation to help a collateral relative, this assistance is not given unconditionally. The important consideration is that it must not conflict with the interests of the family. This emerges very clearly in situations of physical violence. A man is not expected to accept responsibility for avenging the death of a collateral kinsman. He will give moral support to the family of the victim but he is unlikely to go [682] farther than that. A vengeance killing leads to the arrest of the killer and a prison sentence, which is sometimes followed by self-imposed exile in another district of Greece when there is any fear of counter vengeance. In this way a shepherd's family might lose its protector at least for some years, perhaps for ever. Only in unusual circumstances where a man feels that his

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

honour is very closely identified with the blood of the murdered man is it possible that a cousin, uncle, or nephew may undertake this duty; and there have been no such cases in recent years. In any case such a situation would only arise where the murdered man had no family relative, a brother or even an infant son, who could balance the debt of blood at that time or in the future.

It is quite a different matter when a man is physically attacked in the presence of a kinsman. The latter cannot stand by and do nothing; indeed, it is a personal insult to a man that another should dare to strike his kinsman before his eyes. Fights and brawls are not infrequent; they may happen in coffee-shops when a man is winning too successfully at cards, in a dispute over the boundaries of grazing land, or at a wedding when men drink to excess and see a veiled insult in each word or gesture. Yet these fights seldom lead to a killing. The Sarakatsani are very aware of the consequences of murder and vengeance killing; and even when they seem to be in the grip of ungovernable rage they do not draw a knife unless they see, or sense, that there are witnesses uncommitted by kinship obligation who will prevent them from using it. It is noticeable that in boundary disputes, where two shepherds may sometimes find themselves alone, quarrels are more often decided with iron-hooked shepherds' crooks, capable of ugly but generally not mortal wounds. In a brawl, as distinct from a calculated vengeance killing, a shepherd relies on the active support of a kinsman, for this does no injury to the interests of his family; on the contrary, the family gains honour by action, but loses it by inaction.

We must distinguish between two kinds of favour and service which may be exchanged between collateral kin; and it is, again, the question of responsibility to the family which marks the form of this distinction. In the first instance a man is able to assist his kinsman in a manner which cannot possibly conflict with the interests of his own family or become a charge on its limited resources. Shelter and hospitality, information about the affairs of other people and their gossip, physical support in a brawl, are examples of this kind of assistance. These services are true favours (χάρες) which in a relationship of personal kinship a man is bound to perform. 'We hold to our kindred' (χρατᾶμε

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

612 τὸ σόϊ) the Sarakatsani say. But a man's own feelings also prompt
476 him to give this help. Like the grace of God, which is expressed by the same word, such favours are generally without motive or conscious sense of calculation.

There are, however, other forms of assistance and co-operation between collaterals which make some demand on the material wealth of a kinsman and his family. This is no longer merely a matter of personal kinship solidarity, since it is the principle of parental obligation which guides a man in his conduct as trustee of the corporate resources of the family, human
[431] and material, under his control. He is not free to make gifts of
[675] money or animals to a kinsman in difficulties. Yet it is still possible for the families of these men to help one another in situations which involve corporately owned resources, providing that the assistance or co-operation is on a contractual basis of strict accountability. And this, of course, is only possible because between kinsmen there are normally sentiments of confidence and trust. In this way kinsmen sometimes make modest money loans, pasture each other's animals for a consideration, and frequently join in the co-management of their flocks.

The history of the misfortunes of Vasili Arvanitis illustrates this distinction. In the spring of 1955 his winter pastures were flooded by the irrigation of adjoining fields and, as often happens in these conditions, his animals contracted liver-fluke. From a flock of 105 sheep only 63 survived, an entirely inadequate number to support a growing family of five children. Vasili has a first cousin, Spiros Tangas, a more fortunate Sarakatsanos with 450 animals and a small property in the winter pastures near
[409] Preveza. When Spiros learned of the difficulties of his cousin he at once left home and went by bus to Igoumenitsa, a day's
[662] journey away. There he visited an official of the Ministry of
426 Agriculture, a friend who had baptized his youngest daughter,
[851] and asked him if he would try to arrange his cousin's application for a considerable loan from the Agricultural Bank. For such applications are sometimes delayed for many months because of the formalities of proof relating to the cause of the animals' death. The following day he made another bus journey of some hours to a small town where the Mayor was an animal dealer with whom he sometimes did business. The Mayor introduced him to a friend with a few acres of rough

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

pasture which he was willing to rent to Vasili for the weeks that remained before the Sarakatsani began their journey to the Zagori mountains. Spiros paid him twelve pounds for the use of the pasture and sent a message to Vasili to bring his surviving animals as quickly as possible before they, too, contracted the disease. He also told him to send his wife and children to Spiros' own home, since it would not be worth while constructing new huts for so short a time.

At the time, I suggested to Spiros that he had acted very generously towards Vasili. But he could only shrug his shoulders, not in modesty for this was entirely foreign to his nature, but because he felt that his conduct was only natural and did not call for any explanation. At the same time he made it quite clear that Vasili would have to repay the twelve pounds. He admitted without embarrassment that Vasili would be in great difficulties for many years to come. Nevertheless each family had its own responsibilities, for instance he himself was hoping to set up one of his sons as a shopkeeper in Jannina. He did not expect repayment this year or even next. And anyway, he added, Vasili would not allow him to forget the debt. In fact, later in the summer of the same year when Vasili had received a much reduced sum of money for the sale of his milk, he at once repaid the loan. Spiros' comment to me was simply, 'You see how quickly he paid off the debt. We have trust in our kinsmen.' The time and energy which Spiros gave to the arrangement of his kinsman's affairs, the use of his valuable patronage relationships with a Ministry official and the mayor of a local town, were favours freely given, mere incidents in the personal relations of cousins. But the money, although not a particularly large sum, was part of the wealth of the family and under no circumstance could it be alienated.

2. COUSINS

Cousins are the most significant of a person's collateral kinsmen both for purposes of practical co-operation and for simple companionship. This is particularly true of the periods immediately before and after marriage. For these are the years when the individual's social reputation and prestige are judged by the community, and when the problems and difficulties of establishing a family require the practical assistance and moral support of

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

a wide circle of kin. It is entirely consistent with these needs that the collateral extension of the kindred is wider in a person's own generation than in either the first ascendant or descendant generations. As the children of a family approach adult status, a father through the identification of his interests with those of his children, is drawn less into the affairs of his own cousins and becomes more concerned with the cousins of his children's kindred, who from his point of view include affinal relatives as well as the children of his own siblings and first cousins.

The essence of cousinhood, as indeed of all collateral kinship, is that measure of confidence and altruism to which we have referred more than once. Cousins are the children or grandchilden of siblings and the values of cousinship contain the ideal that their affections are like those of brothers and sisters. Cousins are genuinely concerned about each others' successes or misfortunes, hopes and fears. When a man meets a cousin after a long interval of time there is obvious pleasure on both sides. They find a quiet corner away from other people and a conversation begins which, if circumstances allow, may continue for many hours. There is a certain conventional sequence of topics. At first there are detailed inquiries about the health of each member of the two families. This is followed by an exchange of information about sheep and grazing, marriages and match-making in either family or amongst their kinsmen. Afterwards the talk ranges in random fashion over many subjects, the local personalities and gossip of their villages, the latest oppressive measure of government bureaucrats. What is so striking about the private talk of kinsmen is its fluency, freedom, and its mellow modulated tones. It presents a striking contrast with the talk of unrelated Sarakatsani in the forum of the village square or coffee-shop. There, conversation is a contest of wits, cast in a compulsively restrained monosyllabic form, yet accompanied with the striking of assertive attitudes. It is not intended as a means for exchanging information but rather as a form of protagonistic competition.

There are certain kinds of general social intercourse which are possible only between kinsmen, more especially between cousins. For the Sarakatsani, marriage and sexual relations cannot be separated. A girl who loses her honour is in danger of her life at the hands of her own family. The importance of virginity

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

The importance of virginity
is such that it leads to the complete segregation of the sexes 605
amongst unmarried persons. Only in the family and the kindred 834
is it possible for unmarried persons of opposite sex even to hold
conversation. And it will be remembered that generally men do [582]
not marry until they are thirty, girls until they are about twenty-
five. These two circumstances, a relatively late age of marriage, 605
and the segregation of the sexes except in the family and kin- 835
dred, inevitably add to the value of an unmarried boy's social
relations with his young female cousins; for apart from his own
sisters, they are the only unmarried women of his own genera-
tion with whom he is allowed to have any contact. A youth is [593]
very close to his sister to whom he is bound by categorical
obligations, yet his behaviour with her is restrained. With
female cousins, on the other hand, he behaves in a familiar
manner which includes a good deal of mutual teasing and
bodily contact. Particularly among first cousins of opposite
sex between the ages of thirteen and sixteen familiarity is ex-
pressed in playful wrestling, bottom smacking, and cheek pinch-
ing. Generally, teasing between second cousins of opposite
sex is a little more restrained; for here one approaches the
margin of kinship. The girl is a kinswoman but she is also
almost a 'stranger' in terms of kinship distance. The risk, for a
boy, of being tempted into some sexual misconduct is inherently
greater. Friendship between rather older cousins takes the form
of lounging before the hearth, the youth perhaps resting his
head on the girl cousin's shoulder while they talk and joke.
In this context teasing is a social convention which permits
a form of very mild and unacknowledged sexual byplay, yet
absolutely prohibits any degree of overt sexuality and is easily
rationalized as being 'only a game'. It reconciles the two guises
under which a female cousin appears to the youth; first, as the
only female company of his own age that he is permitted to
enjoy outside his family until he reaches the age of thirty; and
secondly, as a kinswoman whose honour he is bound in faith and
trust to uphold.

If young kinsmen and kinswomen find in each other the only 572
heterosexual companionship which is permitted outside the 605
family, it is also true in a more general sense that in this com- 612
munity true friendship is only possible between kinsmen. Friends
are, necessarily, kinsmen. From this general body of relatives a

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

572 605 612 man finds perhaps two or three cousins with whom his friendship is particularly intimate; this is a relationship based on sympathy and mutual concern for the other, it is the delight taken in the company of the other person for the quality of sociability itself. But these relations of affection and uncalculating trust 572 605 612 tend not to be with cousins with whom a man co-operates, or has co-operated, in the day-to-day management of the same 476 flocks. The goodwill of kinsmen is important both in those situations where purpose, aim, and practical interest are involved, and for its own sake where pleasure is taken in the quality of a friendly sympathetic relationship. In both instances a man finds in his kinsman what lack of trust and antipathy prevents him from seeking in an unrelated individual. But there is a difference between a relationship of co-operation and one of sympathetic friendship. Men who herd their sheep together in the same 'company', are concerned in co-operation between corporate family groups; the obligations of this co-operative activity are specific and quasi-contractual, requiring restraint, discipline, and calculated book-keeping. These are elements at odds with the free, unrestrained, attitudes of devoted personal friendship in which obligations are diffuse not specific in character. In principle one cannot deny a friend what he asks. Therefore, friendship between kinsmen flourishes better where the demands put upon it fall into the category of free favours. And this is more likely to be the case where cousins do not work together.

605 This last consideration raises the question whether there is any significant variation in the degree or quality of solidarity between the various categories of first cousins. Marriage is patrilocal and brothers live for a number of years after their marriage in a united extended family; afterwards they may continue to co-operate as a single sheep management group until their children are often in late adolescence. Although these cousins are unlikely to share a relationship of devoted personal friendship, there is the fact or the memory of common service to the same flocks and of essentially identified interests. The possession of the same surname and the value placed upon relationships which are mediated through male kinsmen, are further factors which encourage a formal preference for cousins who are father's brother's children. Equally, however, early childhood in a joint household and co-operative labour in early

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

604 In general, uncles and aunts, as in our own society, are notoriously indulgent towards their nephews and nieces in their childhood days. Of the father's brothers who may be living for a time in the same extended household, it is the unmarried uncles who are the favourites of the children, dandling them on the knee and buying them sweets; between the married uncles and their young nephews and nieces there is, necessarily, more restraint. Uncles may attempt occasionally to lecture young nephews and nieces but the relationship at this age is essentially one of permissive familiarity. In his adolescence a nephew shows a more formal respect to his uncles who are by this time almost all married men at the height of their powers, yet even now the relationship is nearer to one of easy camaraderie than careful respect. But after his marriage and even for some years before it, the nephew in manner and conversation pays less and less attention to his uncle who is now generally an old man on the brink of retirement if he has not already been forced into it. There is often a touch of impatience in a nephew's attitude to his old uncle; almost, indeed, an air of patronage, though he does not generally show him public disrespect. Affection remains, but an old uncle is of little account in the affairs of the community except occasionally if it is necessary to find a precedent from the past for action in some puzzling situation. For the adult man or woman the practical significance of an uncle or aunt is their function as a mediating link with their children, the cousins of an individual's own age and generation who provide comradeship and support in facing the problems of life in a competitive and hostile community.

3. THE EFFECTIVE KINDRED

● 612 474 605 In many situations formal kinship distance must be the criterion which measures obligation and responsibility, especially where preference has to be given to one kinsman over another. The stani led by Theodoros Ferendinos includes, as well as his married brothers, two cousins; Pericles, a father's brother's son, and Demetrios, a second cousin whose mother and the mother of Theodoros are first cousins. In 1954, when this group could not find sufficient winter grazing, one cousin had to leave the 'company'. Inevitably this was Demetrios, even though he had

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

a very intimate friendship with Theodoros' youngest brother; and despite the fact that Pericles was idle, quarrelsome and inefficient. Similarly, when a man visits another neighbourhood he will always stay at the huts of his first cousin although, on personal grounds, he might prefer to be entertained by a more congenial but more distant kinsman.

These facts are easily understood. A collateral kinship bond is a relationship derived from a pair of siblings. It makes a sensible difference whether this derivation is at one or two removes. And this is so not only on grounds of sentiment but also in relation to the limits of the kindred. The children of first cousins are members of the kindred but the children of second cousins are not kinsmen. The first is a growing relationship, the second is not. A man who is 35 years old will generally know all his first cousins, but sometimes there may be a number of his second cousins whom he has not met personally, although he will always know something about their families and their affairs. Second cousins are on the margin of kinship, people who are nearly 'strangers'. They remain kinsmen who must be guarded and cherished but there is some diminution of responsibility towards them. These facts are illustrated by the different behaviour of first and second cousins which may sometimes be observed at weddings. In the quarrels which flare up on these occasions between unrelated guests, there is always the danger that fighting may become so violent and general that the wedding festivities have to be abandoned; this is a great disgrace for the family which is acting as host. It is noticeable that a bridegroom's first cousins feel it is their responsibility to prevent this both by the swiftness of their intervention, where their own kinship alignments allow this, and by the restraint they hold over their own feelings when they are themselves concerned in some incident. Second cousins on the other hand abandon themselves more easily to considerations of injured dignity and self-regard and, in the rush of blood to their heads, temporarily forget their duties to kinsmen.

Yet despite the general importance of kinship distance as a measure of obligation and solidarity, a quality which is particularly characteristic of the kindred is its flexibility. If a man has interests in some part of the community where he can find only a second cousin, or an uncle who is a cousin of one of his

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

612 parents, he may yet establish with him a relationship which is
605 closer and more significant than the relationships he has with other kinsmen genealogically less distant but living in places where his affairs do not lead him. Similarly, if a man is forced by circumstances to co-operate in sheep management with a distant uncle or second cousin this transforms a genealogically distant connexion into a close and very significant kinship bond. Naturally, a man normally prefers to co-operate and have intimate friendships with close relatives, but in their absence, or where there is an exceptionally strong personal preference for an individual kinsman who is not closely connected, a distant kinsman is, as it were, 'drawn in' so that what becomes significant is the fact of relationship and not the genealogical distance separating kinsmen. This potential efficiency of any kinship relation is perhaps reflected in the way a man refers to a cousin when he is in his presence. In explaining that a man is a first cousin he will say, 'He is my first cousin', but of his second cousin he will only say 'He is my cousin'. By omitting any reference to the distance of cousinship, the effect is to draw the distant kinsman nearer to the man who is speaking. It might be said that an individual has two kindreds; the first is the 'ideal' kindred in which conflicts of obligation and responsibility to kinsmen are measured by formal kinship distance; the second is the 'effective kindred' in which the frequency and character of kinship intercourse which actually takes place, and the practical needs of a man and his family, are also important considerations.

Genealogical connexion beyond the limits of the kindred is not normally of any significance. Men who are third or fourth cousins may possibly be aware of this fact but in general it does not make them behave towards one another differently than
612 they would if they were unrelated. But if a man possesses wealth
605 or influence in the community so that some advantage is to be
557 gained by claiming relationship with him, then he often finds that his 'effective kindred' extends beyond the conventional range of second cousinship and comes to include third and even fourth cousins. When Sotiri Achnoulas, who unlike most of the Sarakatsani in Zagori has more goats than sheep in his flock, was dismayed at the promulgation of a government order forbidding the pasturage of these animals in certain areas of the

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

Zagori, he decided to pay a visit to his 'cousin' John, a Sarakatsanos of wealth and influence. He was confident that John could help him through his influence over the local Member of Parliament. 'He has him in his pocket' (τὸν ἔχει στὴ τσέπη του), he explained. John and Sotiri are third cousins. This otherwise tenuous and formally unrecognized kinship link is 'drawn in' to provide a basis of mutual trust in a relationship which is clearly one of patronage. John, for his part, does not resent the importunate requests of his distant relatives. The ability to bestow patronage is its own reward, for it increases his prestige not only in the community of Sarakatsani but with such personalities as parliamentary candidates who compete for the votes which they believe he commands.

A man's 'effective kindred' may also be considerably more restricted than the conventional limits allow. This happens when a family possesses so little prestige that kinsmen would rather not have any unnecessary association with its members. A case in point is the family of Pistiolis at Skamneli which is desperately poor and although morally upright is almost socially outcast. The genealogical information which the father was able to provide was meagre. He did not even know where most of his first cousins were living, and of second cousins he could name only a few. Over a long period of years he had received very few invitations to the weddings of kinsmen, and although he travelled considerably, earning a pittance by carrying goods on his two pack mules, he was too ashamed to ask for hospitality at a kinsman's home in the places where he knew them to be living; consequently he always slept in the open, a circumstance which encouraged mocking remarks about his shaggy and uncouth appearance.

But besides the flexibility in the range of obligations to collateral kinsmen there are also situations which may lead to their complete abrogation. Trust and mutual confidence is the basis of kin relationship. Quarrels which question these qualities are rare, but where they do occur they are far more serious than the differences which are expected to arise between unrelated men. In the latter instance normal social relations may be resumed after a long period of estrangement, but in the former case, especially where one kinsman has publicly insulted another, confidence is permanently destroyed. The proverb,

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

612 'Why is the wound in your eye so deep? Because my kinsman
578 gouged it out' (γιατί'ν'τὸ μάτι σου βαθιὰ βγαλμένο; — γιατί μοῦ
539 τό'βγαλε δυσός), expresses precisely this difference.

612 Between kinsmen who co-operate in a 'company' for the co-
474 management of their flocks it is almost inevitable that from time
578 to time differing interests produce a coolness in their relations. Yet it is remarkable how seldom these frictions develop into the kind of quarrel which causes an irreparable breach. A stern self-control is maintained by these kinsmen on their injured feelings because they know that they depend on each other's assistance in the struggle to survive the hazards, natural and political, which surround them. However, any form of dishonesty in their co-operative handling of the flocks destroys the
[685] basis of their association. Recently a cousin who was herding his sheep with a 'company' of married brothers was discovered during the lambing season in the act of trying to attach a number of his kinsmen's newly born ewe lambs to his own ewes, and his own male lambs to the ewes which he had robbed. Inevitably, after such an incident, the trust between these kinsmen was permanently broken.

835 Incest (αἱμομιξία) represents the most dramatic form of decep-
612 tion that one kinsman can practise on another. Unmarried
605 cousins of opposite sex enjoy an easy, friendly companionship with one another which they are denied with unrelated persons. Very occasionally a youth succumbs to the temptation of sexual experiments with a young kinswoman, an act in which he may destroy both the girl's honour and his own. It seems most unlikely that these affairs, if protracted, can ever remain secret in
835 a community where there are so many questioning eyes. Over
605 a period of ten years I discovered three probable instances, of
558 which one was incest between first cousins. In this case a youth was staying in his uncle's house and there, it seems, seduced the unmarried daughter. The cousin had left his uncle's house before it became apparent that the girl was pregnant, and he naturally denied from a distance that he had had any hand in the matter. The girl for her part claimed that she had been impregnated by divine, not human, means, but little attention was paid to this suggestion. The girl's family did not take any drastic action
[684] in the matter beyond disposing of the child when it was born. The girl herself was allowed to live; and in fact, a year or two

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

The girl herself was allowed to live; and in fact, a year or two later was married off to a poor widower who extracted a considerable dowry in consideration of her blemished history. Although the girl had an unmarried brother no action was ever taken against the alleged seducer. The family claimed that it would not be right to kill a first cousin (any more than a brother) whatever the crime committed, and there are those who agree that there was some force in this argument. But there are others who do not hold this view and believe that the family made a virtue of a dishonourable preference. In any case the family emerged from this affair with its honour destroyed. Needless to say, all forms of social intercourse have ceased between the kinsmen concerned. This involved the destruction of the relationship between the brothers who were the heads of the two families. Incest between first cousins is a sin, for the same blood turns in upon itself in the pollution of sexual intercourse. It is something which goes against nature and something also which inevitably wrecks the whole scheme of kinship relations.

Sexual intercourse between second cousins is still described as incest but it cannot be said in quite the same way that it is an act which goes against nature. Second cousins are kinsmen but they are, also, nearly 'strangers'. Men know that in the towns the Church, from time to time, solemnizes marriages between second cousins, and that in two notorious instances in recent years such marriages have even been contracted by Sarakatsani. But so far as premarital sex relations are concerned the choice here lies between calling them incest or fornication. Whichever term is chosen to describe the liaison, it is less an unnatural sin than conduct of the deepest dishonour. As one man put it with ironic scorn, 'It would be better to marry your own sister' (καλλίτερα νὰ στεφανωθῇς τὴν ἀδερφή σου). But although an illicit affair between second cousins is serious enough, for it inevitably destroys the girl's honour and the relationship between the two parents who are first cousins, it does not have quite the same catastrophic consequences for family and kindred relationships as incest between first cousins.

It is clear, then, that where there is a flagrant breach of the norms of kinship, the relationship is annulled. The trust which is the basis of kinship relations is an axiomatic value in Sarakatsan life which is never questioned. From the injured kinsman's point of view there can be no extenuating circumstances which

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

612 183 in time, and after long consideration, may provide the offender with an excuse. There is no basis for forgiveness and reconciliation.

612 622 The support of kinsmen is also withdrawn sometimes in a manner which does not necessarily imply a permanent rupture of social relations, though it may come to this in the end. I have previously emphasized the importance of the moral support of kinsmen when the community is evaluating a man's conduct.

[539] The idea that a man must defend the actions of his kinsmen is expressed in the proverb, 'Ο δικός μπορεῖ νὰ πῇ μὰ δὲν μπορεῖ ν'ἀκούσῃ. Literally this means, 'A relation can speak to his kinsman but he cannot listen to something about him', that is to say he can scold a kinsman for his shortcomings in private, but he will not allow others to accuse him in public. This in general is true, but it depends upon the possibility of advancing some reasonable explanation of a kinsman's conduct. Where a man has behaved in a manner clearly at variance with the values of the community a kinsman is forced to abandon him, and even to take some part in condemning his conduct. For if he continues to support his cause his own reputation and that of his family will suffer. By condemning the actions of his kinsmen he expresses in an unequivocal fashion that he supports the values of the community; and he maintains a measure of social distance between himself and his kinsman. In this way he hopes to avoid the taint of association with his conduct and the shame which accompanies it.

684 612 629 The history of Nasios illustrates this process. One afternoon in the summer of 1953 he happened to meet Mitrina Mastoras on the hill-side above his village, and there, after failing to win her willing co-operation, he attempted to take her 'by force' (μὲ τὸ ζόρι); but unsuccessfully according to Mitrina's story. The terrified woman ran down the hill to the huts of her second cousin for, at the time, her own husband was away from home. The cousin at once sent word to the husband who returned immediately. He surprised Nasios, knocked him to the ground, and had already drawn his knife to settle the matter when he was seized from behind by two villagers. In terror Nasios escaped to his home.

Public opinion was unanimous in condemning Nasios. This was not the first time he had attacked women, although on the

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

two previous occasions he had more wisely confined his attentions to gipsy women. His family was in any case poor and of low prestige. There was nothing at all to be said in his favour. He had a number of kinsmen among the Sarakatsani who graze the lands of the same village, and of these the closest was Evangelos Balatsos, a first cousin. Evangelos and the other kinsmen all joined in the universal condemnation of Nasios. During the weeks which followed Evangelos made a point of going each day to the home of Nasios and unnerving him with imaginary accounts of the plots and ambushes which the husband of Mitrina was preparing to lure him to his death. So thorough were his efforts that for the next two months, until the Sarakatsani left for the winter pastures, Nasios was never seen outside his hut in daylight. Evangelos after his daily visits to Nasios made his way to the coffee-shop where he described to an appreciative audience the state of affairs in Nasios's household, how he remained each night, sleepless behind the door with axe in hand, and how his wife was obliged under cover of darkness to remove his faeces from the hut. In this fashion Evangelos took a leading part in the shaming of his kinsman, and saved his own name by denying solidarity with his kinsman and damaging his reputation.

The possibility of losing the moral and practical support of kinsmen, perhaps for ever, is clearly a most powerful sanction of the norms of kinship behaviour and the values of the wider community. If Nasios, a poor man who herded the sheep of villagers, had possessed a substantial flock and had therefore been dependent on the help of kinsmen in a 'company', this estrangement from his kinsmen would have affected him even more seriously than it did. It is also evident that the application of this sanction by the kinsman is itself sanctioned by the threat that a man and his family may lose prestige if he does not temporarily abandon the evil-doer. Since the interests of the family always take precedence over obligations of individual collateral kinship, there is never any doubt that a man will conform. We see, not for the first time, the connexion between prestige values and the isolation of the family; for these values necessarily threaten the solidarity of any personal relationship or social grouping which may conflict with a man's duty to uphold, or promote, the prestige of his family.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

4. EXPRESSIONS OF SOLIDARITY

619 612 [581] The Zagori community of Sarakatsani is geographically dispersed for reasons which are mainly ecological. Patrilocal marriage, suspicion of affines who live near the same village, yet the need for strategic alliances in other parts of Zagori, are factors which lead men to look for brides in a distant neighbourhood. Consequently the kindred of any individual tends to be more or less congruent with the boundaries of the community itself, in the sense that a shepherd generally has at least a few relatives in any quarter of the Zagori. For these reasons the few festive occasions during the year which bring distant kinsmen together are looked forward to with some anticipation. This is so not only for the utilitarian consideration that it is valuable to renew associations with kinsmen whose practical help may be required in the future, but simply for the company of people who value a man and return his affections. It is an aspect of the constant yearning for unity in a society which is, in fact, fragmented by exclusive familial loyalties. It might be said that these occasions when kinsmen meet are important because in the atmosphere of festival excitement the sentiments of kinship solidarity are strengthened and recreated. At weddings, for example, quarrels almost always develop between unrelated guests, and the kinsmen who rush to the aid of their own people are giving a dramatized expression to the ideal of kinship solidarity. But, if it is true that the gathering of dispersed kinsfolk is an occasion for the restatement of kinship values, it is also true that it is the sentiment of kinship which invokes the gathering at all. Thus, although wedding invitations are sent out to all consanguineal and to a large number of affinal relatives, not all of the more distantly related of these persons will attend, and it is always recognized that whether or not an invited kinsman comes to the wedding is an indication of the effective solidarity, or absence of solidarity, between the invited man's family and the family of the groom or bride. Naturally the whole of the kinsman's family cannot attend a wedding together. The demands of shepherding prevent this. But one member at least is expected to go as a representative.

527 612 571 [183] 585 527 612 [570]

612 574 A man, of course, may visit a kinsman at any time; in his huts he will always find shelter and hospitality for the night.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

But these visits are unlikely to be merely social and the main purpose of the journey is generally the arrangement of some business. At festivals, on the other hand, kinsmen meet to enjoy one another's company and other considerations are secondary. On the Tuesday after Easter Monday a man often sets off on a journey to a close kinsman living at a distance whom he has not seen during the winter. And after the feast of St. George before the migration to summer pastures there may be a wedding to attend. Later in the year when the Sarakatsani have moved up to the mountain villages of the Zagori there are other opportunities to meet less closely related kinsmen. About the end of July when the impregnated ewes gradually cease to yield milk, there is more leisure for the shepherds to attend the weddings, most of which occur in August and September. Also a number of the villages in the Zagori celebrate in the summer the feast-day of their patron saint. These village feasts (πανηγύρια) last for three days and nights during which there is almost continuous dancing in the village square with much eating and drinking besides. Many Sarakatsani go to these village festivals not only when it is the feast-day of the saint of their own summer village, but also to the celebrations of other villages where they have a kinsman. In the holiday atmosphere they are hospitably welcomed and their company and conversation give pleasure to their hosts. It makes no difference whether visitors are near or distant relatives; the more visitors a family entertains the more its prestige increases. But in addition to these public festivals each Sarakatsan family, or stani, celebrates privately one of the three summer religious festivals which they consider important. These are: the prophet Elias, 20th July, Saint Paraskeve, 26th July, and the Assumption of the All Holy One (The Virgin Mary), 15th August. On these feast-days meat is killed, wine is drunk, and in the larger stanis there is dancing. It is essentially a family celebration but kinsmen, who live in other villages and celebrate a different festival, will come to visit and share in the festivities. These are the various occasions which help to maintain a certain minimal frequency of contact between dispersed kinsmen, although the demands of the sheep prevent any individual shepherd from being present at more than one or perhaps two of these events each year.

But weddings are, undoubtedly, the most significant of these

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

585 612 festivals. An invitation morally obliges a family to send a representative. It is not a question of whether a man can afford the time and expense to go and enjoy himself for three or four days, but rather that it is his duty to attend and support the family of the bride or groom simply because the members of that family are kinsmen. A man may pay a visit to a kinsman or assist him in some way out of motives which are in part practical and ulterior, but he goes to help a kinsman at his wedding without such utilitarian interest. The kinsman may live in a part of Zagori or the winter pastures where he is unlikely to be of any assistance. He may be poor while the wedding guest may be rich. It might perhaps be argued that a man stands by his kinsmen at their weddings so that in return they will support the [554] weddings in his own family. For it is true that if a large number of kinsmen come to a wedding the family gains prestige. But more important than this outward sanction is the inner concern for, and interest in, the personal affairs of a kinsman. In this matter as in the other moral obligations of kinship the Sarakatsani advance no explanation of why they must act in a particular way beyond the comment 'That's how we found it and that's [577] the way we keep it' (έτσι τὸ βρήκαμε καὶ έτσι τὸ κρατᾶμε). In other words, in discussing the solidarity of the kindred we are dealing with self-evident values which appear to a man to be sentiments innate in every Sarakatsanos.

The wedding customs of the Sarakatsani reflect in many ways the solidarity of kinsmen. And although it is not my purpose to give an exhaustive description of these customs it will be relevant to the present discussion if I indicate in a general way how kinsmen participate in these ceremonies.

The celebrations are held separately by the family of the bride and the family of the groom at their respective homes. The only point at which the activities of the two groups intersect is when the bridegroom arrives on Sunday morning with his bridal procession of kinsmen (ψίκι) to take away the bride. A man who is related to both the bride and the groom must be the guest of only one side. He is not permitted to spend part of the time with both groups.

585 612 261 [431] Each guest to a wedding brings an offering of food and wine. This consists of a round of bread (κουλούρα) with symbolical ornamentations on the crust; a wooden bottle (βουτσέλι) of wine; and a slaughtered lamb or sheep.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

wine; and a slaughtered lamb or sheep. For the Sarakatsani a meal is a family communion to which unrelated shepherds are never invited. The wedding-feast is the family meal writ large with the family of the kindred sitting down to eat bread together. For all food is in a generic sense bread. 'Come, let us eat bread', cries the wedding master of ceremonies. As E. S. Drower[1] has said in discussing the symbolism of bread in Mediterranean cultures, 'It is not only the symbol of life. Bread, itself a union of many grains into a single substance, when broken into fragments and divided amongst many, becomes a symbol of life shared, of a society at peace with itself, of a family bound together by a common factor.'

Wine, too, is a life-fluid. It is drunk ritually by the bride and groom during the religious wedding ceremony. From the Saturday till the Tuesday afternoon, when the festivities end, it is drunk to excess by the whole bibulous assembly. A glass of wine must be accompanied by a toast, and every man tries to drink to the health of each of his kinsmen present. Wine is the symbol of blood; and each toast affirms a relationship. 'To your health, John' (Γειά σου Γιάννη). 'To your marriages, boys' (Μωρὲ παιδιὰ στὶς χαρές σας), when drinking with unmarried youths or young men; or simply, 'To your wedding' (στὸ γάμο σου). 'To the marriages of your sons' (στῶν παιδιῶν σας), in a toast to married men. 'A happy old age' (καλὰ γεράματά σας), used in drinking to the old men. And so on.[2]

In the confined space of an arbour covered with thick woollen blankets, between one hundred and two hundred men and boys are gathered. In the centre of the floor space the dancing only stops when the company sits down to eat. Then the plates of roasted meat are devoured almost in silence. Afterwards the dance is on again. Those who are not dancing, sing in accompaniment. The gipsy band beat out strange and exciting rhythms in which the high-pitched clarinet is never silent. In this intense atmosphere with men drinking steadily and shouting their toasts across the heads of the squatting assembly to their kinsmen, any link of kinship makes men like brothers, its absence potential enemies. For it must not be forgotten that although the wedding guests are all related in some fashion to

[1] E. S. Drower, *Water into Wine*, London, 1956, p. 44.
[2] See Höeg, op. cit., vol. i, p. 30.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

585 612 273 579 their hosts, they are not necessarily related to one another. Men whose pride is always sensitive become tense with nervous excitement and excess of alcohol. An alleged word or act which is interpreted as insulting, or the memory of a past grievance, may be the occasion of a quarrel; and this, if it is not controlled at once, may end in general violence by mobilizing support for the antagonists along the lines of kinship allegiance. As I have already suggested, these fights give very tangible expression to kinship bonds. But there are, also, less dramatic forms of communion. During the three days and nights of sustained revelry there are occasional breaks of an hour or two when musicians rest or the company observe some item of wedding custom such as the display of the bride's dowry. Then kinsmen sit apart and exchange their news of families and marriages, sheep and politics.

585 612 105 Guests come to a wedding to support their kinsmen. They do this not only by their presence but also by lending practical assistance. Among the men this applies particularly to the first [252] cousins of the bride or groom. These relatives take a hand in preparing the carcasses of the animals for roasting by fixing them on spits. Later they supervise the fires over which the spits are turned and they baste the meat to prevent it from burning. They cut up the whole animal into individual portions. [264] When the meal is ready it is the first cousins who assist the brothers of the family to lay cloths on the ground, pass round forks and spoons and finally hand to each guest his individual portion of meat. [261] After the meal is over it is again first cousins who stand in the middle of the dancing, one with a bottle of ouzo and the other with a plate of cheese or olives to give refreshment to the sweating dancers. These are not considered to be menial tasks; on the contrary, it is a privilege of close kinship to be allowed to assist in this way.

585 612 562 The women hold their sombre, almost melancholy, celebrations apart from the men in a nearby hut where they sing and sometimes dance. Here, again, the close female relatives of the family assist in handing round the food. But of the women guests it is the old grandmothers who play the most important [603] [252] role. Outside in the open-air kitchen they preside over the huge cooking-pots of potatoes, stews, and soups, enlivening their labours with gossip and attended by dogs and children anticipating scraps.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

The support of kinsmen for the bride or groom is expressed more specifically in particular points of marriage custom. One of the more important ceremonies is 'The sewing of the wedding standard' (τὸ ράψιμο τοῦ φλάμπουρου), which takes place on the Saturday evening after the guests have arrived. For this standard, which flies from the hut of the groom until the marriage has been consummated, is more than a sign that nuptial celebrations are in progress; it is a symbol of marriage itself, the joining of noble youth with virgin maid.[1] In standing with him at this ceremony the company of kinsmen witness their certain knowledge of the bridegroom's nobility and their belief in the bride's virginity. Only the joining of these qualities in a marriage celebrated before God makes possible parenthood with honour. 'Whose is the wedding standard, noble and red? It is the standard of the bridegroom . . .' (Τίνος εἶν'τὸ φλάμπουρο, τ'ἄξιο καὶ τὸ κόκκινο, τοῦ γαμπροῦ εἶν'τὸ φλάμπουρο . . .), they sing. A standard requires a standard-bearer (φλαμπουράρης), and for this coveted position a youth between the ages of sixteen and twenty is chosen. He must not have had experience of sexual intercourse and both his mother and father must be alive. He is almost always a young first cousin or nephew of the groom. On the Saturday night the flag, which nowadays is the national flag of Greece, is sewn by the youth to a pole some six or seven feet in length, at the top of which a small wooden cross is secured. As the boy sews the flag the whole company of kinsmen stand around him in a circle and sing the appropriate wedding song. When the sewing is completed, the boy impales pomegranates or apples, symbols of fertility, on the three points of the small wooden cross and, finally, ties to the flag-pole below the cross a handkerchief and two strands of wool, one coloured red for virility, the other white for purity. The guests now form a dance-ring, the band strikes up, and the standard-bearer leads the dance holding aloft in his right hand the newly sewn standard. He then sets up the flag in the thatch of the groom's hut at the right-hand side of the doorway where it remains until the next morning, when the standard-bearer, mounted on a fine horse, lifts it down from the roof and leads the groom's bridal procession on its journey to the home of the bride.

The groom and his family rely on the support of their kindred

[1] At the weddings of widows or widowers no flag is flown.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

585 to make the bridal procession the spectacular occasion it must
●612 appear if their prestige is to be maintained in the community.
[492] They give this support by their numbers, their own bearing, and the quality of their horses and the coloured woollen saddle-cloths which are draped over the backs of the animals. For whenever the procession passes through or close to a village both Sarakatsani and villagers line the path, to enjoy the spectacle with critical eyes, and to exchange greetings with the
[522] riders. The watchers laugh excitedly and try to draw the riders into an exchange of bawdy quips and jokes, but the horsemen must remain unmoved with upright backs and proud serious faces.

Earlier on the same Sunday morning before the bridal procession sets out on its journey, the bridegroom is prepared for
[302] his ordeal. Seated on a chair outside the door of his hut he is attended by a kinsman with the necessary skill, who cuts his hair, shaves his beard, and trims the moustache. This, like the sewing of the standard, is a part of customary wedding ritual.
[533] The kinsmen gather about the groom and accompanied by the gipsy band sing about the shaving of the bridegroom. From time to time the singing is interrupted by heated debate between the watching kinsmen and the barber as to the style of the hair cutting, the angle of the moustache, and the effectiveness of the shaving. For they fear the appraisal of strangers on the road and the malicious hopes of the bride's kinsmen that the bridegroom will in some way look ridiculous.

585 After the barber has completed his task, two or three of
605 the more senior first cousins with a reputation for worldly
292 knowledge go into the hut to supervise the changing of the bridegroom's clothes (ν'ἀλλάξουν τὸ γαμπρό). The Sarakatsani
[178] have abandoned the traditional kilt and today the prosaic costume of a bridegroom consists of a white shirt buttoned to the neck without a tie, and a blue suit of manufactured cloth.
[754] The cousins help their young kinsman to put on these clothes to
[433] which he is not accustomed and they make certain that he does not change his underclothes; for with these an envious man or woman might affect the sexual potency of the groom by sorcery. As a prophylactic against the same peril they place some steel object in the folds of the shirt tails before he puts it on. As he is
585 dressed, almost like a child, they feed him with various pieces
605

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

of good advice, telling him in detail how he must deport himself that day on the road and later at the home of the bride.

At the home of the bride kinsfolk support her family in a similar manner, particularly in a number of situations where a measure of dramatized hostility is shown to the groom's party when they arrive to take away the bride; but these are episodes which I shall describe in the following chapter. The dressing and adornment of the bride, naturally, is a more elaborate affair than the preparation of the groom. In this, two or three senior married aunts or first cousins generally take a hand, assisted by the more sophisticated village dressmaker who in most cases has been responsible for cutting and sewing the white wedding gown. All through the long night of Saturday the bride sits in her parents' hut. She must not sleep for this would demonstrate an equanimity at odds with the grief she is expected to feel at the thought of leaving her parents and her home on the morrow. Her kinswomen sit closely round her. Two of them hold her hands. From time to time they sing the repetitive, intensely sad, songs that tell of the bride's departure from the only home she has ever known.

* * *

In this chapter I have attempted to give a fuller description of the relations of collateral kin than it was possible to present in chapter three, where I was mainly concerned to describe the formal characteristics of the kindred. I mentioned, then, that various aspects of kindred relations might be seen in terms of an opposition between the solidarity of siblings and the principle of parental obligation, the former being the source of moral solidarity between kinsmen, the latter strongly influencing the isolation of the family group from the collateral kinsmen of its members. The 'free favours' which a man does without thought or calculation for an uncle, cousin, or nephew, are related to kinship solidarity, the qualities of which follow from the notion of an extensive sibling relationship; while calculated co-operation which involves the corporate wealth of family groups is influenced by the particularistic obligations of parenthood. As one might expect, those cousins, father's brother's children, whose families of origin were concerned in co-operative sheep

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

612 605 management, are the cousins least likely to form those important links of devoted friendship. Since marriage is patrilocal it is the fathers of these cousins who experienced the various constraints of life in an extended family. These considerations do not generally apply to the other categories of first cousin who [572] normally live in other neighbourhoods. It is among these relatives that a man finds his intimate friends. For these cousins are able to emphasize in their behaviour the altruistic qualities of collateral kinship, particularly in the performance of free favours. Various considerations, then, tend to identify the interests of collateral kinsmen, others to set them apart. We may 612 look at this from another point of view. The fact that for any 571 individual the community is divided into the opposed categories of kinsmen, 'own people', and non-kinsmen, 'strangers', is clearly a factor which unites people who can trust one another against the rest of the world who are not to be trusted. Generally, a man can only co-operate with a kinsman, find a true friend among his cousins, talk to an unmarried girl who is a kinswoman, and so on. However, the members of a man's kindred are not undifferentiated. Some are close kinsmen, others more distant. There is not quite the same measure of responsibility and obligation to a second cousin as there is to a first. Moreover, as children grow up their parents are more concerned with their own descendants and less with collateral kinsmen. But, quite apart from any considerations which relate specifically to the internal structure of the kindred, questions of prestige are [558] always a potential threat to the solidarity of kinsmen. Kinsmen are identified in the thoughts of outsiders and if one man loses prestige, whether it is due to moral error, poverty, or physical deformity, his kinsman suffers with him. In these circumstances his only defence is to withdraw temporarily or permanently from the relationship.

Sarakatsani are fully aware of the fragmented character of [538] their community. They realize that one man's hand is turned against another's. They continually lament the distrust which exists between unrelated men and the element of calculation which must exist even in the relations of kinsmen who co-operate at work. They value their relations with kinsmen who [559] live in other neighbourhoods not only for the various practical reasons we have elaborated, but because of the generally

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

altruistic quality of these relationships. This is an end in itself. It balances the qualities of calculation and restraint which enter into all the other situations of social life, excepting only certain contexts of religious experience. This partly explains the immense pleasure which individuals experience when they take part with their kinsmen in festivals and weddings. There is a sense of release from the restrictions of daily life and local animosities which more articulate shepherds describe by the same phrase that is sometimes used after receiving the Eucharist at Easter, 'A weight has left me', μοῦφυγε ἕνα βάρος.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

585 602 [584] Betrothal, marriage, and the 'return' are the three stages in which affinal relations are fully established. The betrothal is the formal contract between the two hostile groups after which there is a period of separation while the two sides, like two opposed camps of war, prepare for the marriage. At the marriage the emphasis is still upon the distance which separates the two groups. Each family surrounded by its own kinsmen and affines celebrates the occasion apart. The two sides make contact only at the point where the groom comes to take away the bride. And this confrontation, although it is marked, as we have seen, by the expression of friendship as well as antagonism, is essentially characterized as a warlike descent.[1] The martial array of the groom's procession, the standard-bearer, the charge of the leading riders to the door of the bride's hut, and the deployment of the bride's supporters to repel this attack, all contribute to form this dramatic impression. After the marriage, until they meet generally two weeks later at the 'return', the two sides adjust themselves to the realities of a new situation. The groom's family try to help the bride overcome her loneliness and despair, while the bride's family, in a sense the defeated party, are anxious and sensitive about the treatment of the bride at her new home. The two groups, despite the inevitable undercurrents of animosity and suspicion, meet at the 'return' fully conscious of the necessity and the advantages of future co-operation.

3. THE OBLIGATIONS OF AFFINES

602 612 The recognition of affinal relationships is even more flexible than the recognition of cognatic kinship. Affinal relationship may be claimed not only with the elementary family of origin of a person's spouse, or the elementary family of origin of the wife or husband of any member in a person's kindred, but also with the entire kindred of the marriage partner. Consequently a man may, if it suits his convenience, describe himself as an affine of the second cousin of the spouse of his second cousin. Generally, however, a man limits his use of the term affine to the kindreds of his own wife, and of the marriage partners of his brothers and sisters, and to only the elementary families

[1] Cf. Chatzimichalis, op. cit., vol i, Part A, p. 205.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

of origin of the marriage partners of his collateral kinsmen. There are also two quasi-affinal relationships which must be mentioned; that of co-bride (συννυφάδα), which is the link between a man's wife and the wife of his brother; and similarly that of co-bridegroom (μπατζανάκης), which describes the relationship of two men who are married to sisters.

The importance of the principle of parental obligation is once more apparent when we ask which are the significant affinal relationships. These are, in fact, the relationships between an individual and those affines who are, or will be, parents of the first cousins of his (or her) own children; more specifically relationships with the husbands or wives of siblings, and with the siblings of the individual's own marriage partner. Whatever a man's personal feelings may be, for the sake of his children he is almost compelled to co-operate with these affines. A brother tries hard to win the goodwill of his sister's husband. He is anxious that she should receive good treatment among the strangers to whom he and his family have given her. And it is noticeable that in the early years of marriage while the bride is still unsure of her position in the new family, her brothers often do more favours and good turns for the husband and his family than they receive in return.

But from the point of view of the husband, too, this is the critical affinal relation. So long as his dealings with the siblings and parents of his wife remain friendly his children are assured of adequate kinship support. In the early years of marriage, the nostalgia of the wife for her family of origin and her old home is not easily appeased. The physical separation of affines does not make visits to her parents very easy, and in any case, as we have seen, her husband and his brothers are not pleased if communication is too frequent. In practice, most young brides manage to visit their homes about twice a year. It is an accepted custom that young brides accompanied by their husbands set out on the Tuesday after Easter to visit the bride's home for five or six days. In the early years, these occasions may be something of an ordeal for the bridegroom. He must show a careful and studied respect towards his father-in-law and mother-in-law (πεθερός, πεθερά). Even with the brother or sister of his wife (κουνιάδος, κουνιάδα) he cannot relax, but must appear at all times severe and grave.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

582 602 elsewhere,' the Sarakatsani say. The restriction on the marriage of close affines, associated with the prohibition on marriage in the kindred, forces those who are searching for prospective brides always to look outside the circle of well established relationships.

582 602 612 Indeed this examination of affinal relationships has largely turned on the various correlates of the prohibition on marriage in the kindred. We have seen that a man must marry a person who, in effect, was formerly an enemy, and that the element of hostility never entirely vanishes from the affinal relationship although a common interest in the children of a marriage produces and sanctions a degree of co-operation between affines. The marriage prohibitions symbolize and divide off a category of social relations based on trust. Those people with whom marriage is permitted are, on the other hand, suspect. The prohibitions clearly set apart non-kinsmen, 'strangers', from kinsmen, 'own people', and the two opposed behaviour patterns which are proper to each of these categories of relations. Affinal connexions compose a third interstitial category of social relations with persons previously strangers to whom a man is related through the contract of marriage of himself or a kinsman. In the opposition between kin and non-kin they tend to be assimilated to the latter category when the practical consideration is one of trust or confidence, and to the former when it is a question of the possibility of co-operation.

582 602 612 554 [558] The marriage prohibitions prevent alliances in the kindred which would in some degree reverse the process of isolation from collateral kinsmen. They also force each family to regard unrelated families as potential affines. In this analysis of Sarakatsan kinship the importance of prestige values has been constantly emphasized. If men of standing will not marry the daughters of a family or give their own in marriage to its sons, the prestige of this family must inevitably fall. The kind of marriage a man or woman makes is an index of prestige and at the same time is a very important element in the future reputation of the new family they are establishing. Therefore marriage prohibitions while they contribute inevitably to the relative isolation of a man from his collateral kin, not only have the consequence that marriages establish co-operative relationships between previously opposed family groups, but

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

they are also an important incidental factor in support of the community's values; because, if men do not conform to these, they and their close kinsmen will not make honourable marriages. What sets men apart in one set of circumstances, tends to unite them in another.

The characteristic ambivalence of affinal relations has analogous consequences in terms of the spatial distribution of kinsmen. The Sarakatsani do not approve of marriages between families who live in the same village neighbourhood. For instance, the marriage of Demetrios Ferendinos to the sister of George Balatsos is the only case in his summer village. It is significant that this alliance provides us with an example of friction between affines. The Sarakatsani tell one that 'affines quarrel easily' (πιάνονται εύκολα οι συμπέθεροι). It is particularly dangerous if the bride is able to run to her parents and brothers with tales of ill-treatment, and gossip about what goes on inside her husband's family. Not only is it safer to keep affines at a distance, but in another neighbourhood they may sometimes be of practical use. Marriages which are arranged between families in different neighbourhoods tend to produce individual kindreds which are dispersed and whose geographical 'boundaries' are roughly congruent with the boundaries of the community itself. A man through his scattered kindred and affinal relations participates vicariously in the life of the community of the Zagori Sarakatsani. If he has a kinsman or affine in a distant neighbourhood, he is interested in its local affairs, for these affect his relative whose interests are a matter of sympathetic concern to him and in certain circumstances may affect his own prestige. Therefore distrust of affines leads to the practice of taking a bride from another, preferably a distant, neighbourhood; this is one factor in the wide dispersion of individual kindreds in the community; and, in turn, this dispersion of recognized kinship ties increases the individual's consciousness of participation and membership in the total community.

These, then, are instances where marriage regulations or conventional attitudes about affines lead to a certain distance, between kinsmen in the first instance, between affines in the second, but in their further consequences encourage a wider synthesis; in the one case, in terms of conformity to the values

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

of the community and the constant proliferation, through marriages, of new relationships between opposed families; and in the other, a moral participation in the affairs of the different local segments of the geographically dispersed community. In both cases these considerations depend ultimately on the simple fact that 'kinsmen' and 'strangers' represent opposed but complementary categories of persons.

* * *

This completes the discussion of the general characteristics of Sarakatsan kinship and marriage. Naturally the consequent system of personal relations has various implications beyond the field of kinship behaviour. Here I will indicate only one of these, but one that is peculiarly characteristic of Greek society and will continue to concern us in the chapters that follow.

As we have seen, the community from the viewpoint of each individual is divided into kinsmen and non-kinsmen, 'own people' and 'strangers'. The division is unequivocal; kinsmen inspire loyalty and obligation, strangers distrust and moral indifference. Yet within the category of kinsmen itself the only stable solidary group is the family. Plainly, the nature of the physical and social environment is such that it forces this small group, however it may value the ideal of autarky, to cultivate both intensively and extensively the support of kinsmen and affines. But for reasons inherent in the structure of the kindred, which it has been my purpose in this and the three preceding chapters to analyse, that support is contingent upon a kinsman's prior commitments to his own family. Thus the family emerges as a social isolate in two associated respects. In the first case, families unrelated by kinship admit virtually no moral obligation towards one another; in the second, families related by kinship nevertheless owe only conditional services. In a community where social relations are marked by such radical discontinuities it follows that the primary values are necessarily particularistic. The mutual opposition of family groups is expressed through the concept of honour with its connotations of exclusiveness, not the morality of universal values such as honesty or fair dealing. And Christian virtues such as humility, meekness, and self-effacement suggest only weakness; whereas

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

own, but four children to provide for. As soon as people begin to calculate in this manner, the inadequacy of his personal wealth emerges, and to some extent his prestige falls. Men with no brothers who are forced to join the 'company' of a cousin or an affine gain some prestige and cover from the size of the co-operating group of which they form a part, but the size of their own flock is always very precisely appreciated by outsiders. The worst situation is that of the family head with only a few animals who is forced to become a wage shepherd to an unrelated man, since in this case poverty associated with dependence on a stranger destroys prestige.

Taken together, numbers and wealth are the necessary material foundation for high family prestige. They imply the independence of the family within the community, both economically in the sense that the group is viable (and possibly free of debt), and technically in that it has enough manpower to manage its flocks unaided. It suggests that the family will possess powerful patrons outside the community and that in the competition for winter pastures it will be in a better position to rent grazing land. A village generally prefers to let an area of reasonable size, and to negotiate with a prosperous group able to provide a steady and profitable flow of bribes and presents.

Also, it is the family of wealth and numbers, with powerful patrons and sufficient winter grazing, that draws to itself a number of less fortunate kinsmen. The dependence and support of these men make the protecting family the nucleus of a co-operative association, extending yet further its strength, influence, and prestige. It attracts many passing visits from other kinsmen. Men do not often visit kinsmen of low prestige, since such association only draws attention to a relationship which is best forgotten: on the other hand, they take every opportunity to pay a call on a kinsman of position and repute, to cultivate a relationship that is a source of possible support in future misfortune and, of itself, brings a measure of vicarious prestige.

Men like Pistiolis, who are at the lowest level of the community hierarchy of prestige, seldom receive a visitor from one year's end to another. Indeed, the number of visitors that a family receives is generally a reliable index of its reputation. It is

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

always known in the neighbourhood when a family has had guests (μουσαφίρηδες); their quality, relationship, and the possible reasons for their visit are debated in detail by the other families. Comment is often caustic, but the very interest which is aroused is a recognition of the importance of the event. If a family of numbers and wealth entertains a patron from the town, this is a triumph which it enjoys to the full. Meat is killed and wine is bought. Largesse is demanded of the family which entertains many guests. And in some mysterious way neighbouring families discover the measure of generosity, or meanness, which a host has shown to his visitors; and criticism, encouraged by envy, will not spare him. In hospitality (φιλοξενία), a virtue in which the Sarakatsani believe they are naturally pre-eminent, there is always a strong element of competition.

(c) LINEAGE[1]

Νταμάρι, lineage, refers to the quality of the kindred relationships which a man inherits from both his father and mother; and the importance of this for prestige has already been discussed in chapter three. If he possesses the surname of one of the leading families, or is directly descended, preferably in the male line, from a famous tselingas of the last century, this also is a significant element in a man's reputation. It might appear to indicate that for the highest and the lowest families, at least, reputation of lineage is patrilineally inherited. There is, indeed, a bias in favour of relationships traced through the father (particularly agnatic relationships) in the evaluation of νταμάρι in all families, and this is certainly accentuated at either extreme of the hierarchy of prestige, where certain family names are associated with the idea of high or low reputation, but the inheritance of νταμάρι remains fundamentally bilateral. In general, as we shall see in a discussion of marriage, men are careful to marry their sons or daughters into families of equal reputation. Where a member of a leading family takes a bride of markedly lower lineage, the community withdraws from the new family the recognition of the prestige associated with the husband's surname by the simple procedure of refusing to call

[1] Lineage, here, does not, of course, refer to a unilineal descent group but to the quality of pedigree through all lines of descent.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

him by this name, and substituting some nickname, or patronymic.

But the prestige of lineage depends itself on the attributes of wealth and numbers which have already been examined. It does not help a poor man to claim that his great-grandfather was a famous tselingas with two thousand sheep. It is true that a father, or grandfather, who had the necessary wealth to support the nobility of his line is a saving grace for those who have lost their flocks, but it is a small one. The children of a leading family whose wealth has vanished suffer the same fate as the children of a family whose father, although from a family of the 'first lineage', has married beneath himself, that is they literally 'lose' their name, the surname of the father. Lineage refers to prestige in the past, while the essence of competition in this community is concerned with influence in the present. Therefore, a 'name', without the means to support it, is not recognized.

This, in practice, is the mechanism that restricts the number of families that can successfully claim to be of 'first lineage'. Not all the collateral relatives of a leading family are recognized as equivalent in prestige, for without numbers and wealth they cannot aspire to this. And it is inherently unlikely that they will all possess these advantages. There are two important limiting factors. With the rule of equal inheritance between brothers, the size of the group of brothers which is necessary to build and protect wealth and prestige, itself is the cause, in the next generation, of the fragmentation of this wealth. The second factor is disease. Twenty years ago sheep-pox, and today liver-fluke, are diseases capable of decimating a flock within a short time. However honourable a man, the loss of his flocks must diminish his own prestige to some degree, and that of his children more seriously.

(D) MARRIAGES

Τὸ συμπεθεριό is the affinal relationship between two previously unrelated families. It is in the early days of summer that the families of men who wish to take wives in the following year begin to consider the question of finding suitable affines and, during these weeks, the gossip of the community is much concerned with news and speculation about matchmaking.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

156 in the eyes of others, and how their evaluation of himself relates to the ideal image of how he would wish to appear. Clearly, the more the publicity that surrounds any particular area of social life, the greater is the efficacy of the sentiment of self-regard as a sanction of approved qualities and conduct.

156 577 578 A man's self-regard is typically molested where he is insulted or defamed or believes himself to be so treated. When another person suggests by even indirect allusion that a man is dishonourable or weak he molests his self-regard (προσβάλλει τὸν ἐγωϊσμό του). Or when a man by deed, or word, behaves towards another in such a way as to suggest that he is not worthy of consideration and recognition, he again molests his self-regard; for a man only acts in this way towards another when he considers him to be of lesser reputation and, by inference, less honourable. In such circumstances the core of a man's social personality is touched, his manliness and prepotence are questioned. Then, the only remedy is to attack his detractors with knife or stick.

There are many instances of such a situation. The stoning of a sheep by another shepherd when it has strayed across a boundary. An unguarded public remark which the recipient judges others will consider to be an unanswered insult if he 156 does not retaliate. It is, in part, self-regard which urges the 577 abduction of a girl when a candidate bridegroom has been 583 refused by the girl's father. Christos Kazoukas was refused the hand of the daughter of Paschos. She was too young, the girl's father said, and as she was, indeed, only twenty-two, Christos was prepared to accept this explanation rather than undertake the dangerous business of abduction. But George Carvounis, a second cousin to Christos, heard a different tale that the girl's family had refused Christos because it was said that he was sexually impotent and inadequate. In fact, the girl's mother had dubbed him by a nickname, 'Lame penis' (κουτσοπούτσα), which referred literally to these supposed short-comings. Christos had a smooth skin, fine features and a strikingly high-pitched voice. Simply, he did not look the part 624 of a pallikari. There was, therefore, all the greater urgency that he should reply to these damning allegations; for the 612 alternative was ridicule and shame. His kinsmen offered united moral support and the unspoken threat of abandonment if

he did nothing.

/22 cont./

361 become flooded. The entrance of the huts faces south to protect them
22 as much as possible from the north wind. The sheepfolds are built
233 on gentle slopes in order to facilitate the discharge of water and liquid manure. However, while the sheepfolds are always situated close to the pasturage, the pens of the goats are placed as far away as possible, on some rocky point where tough shrubs grow.

361 It is thus, as we see, the configuration of the ground that
233 determines the construction of the camp, always accomodating the needs of people and animals.

361 The summer camp is clearly divided into two parts: the place
22 occupied by the huts, constructed according to the rules given above,
233 and the place occupied by the flocks. But the latter place does not have sheepfolds. Actually, during the summer, the shelters built for
[417] the animals are very rudimentary. Thanks to the mildness of the
[824] climate, the shepherds simply confine the livestock in enclosures made by placing prickly shrubs upon one another and they do so during the night only, so that the animals will not disperse. The surveillance
[231] and safety of the livestock is always ensured by the shepherds themselves and by their dogs.

Neither in the winter camp nor in the summer camp does one see any building for the benefit of the group as a whole; there is no place of public assembly (even in the open), no path, no fountain--a feature /absence?/ altogether characteristic of their life.

361 /23/ On the other hand, a close observation of the aggregate of huts shows very distinct small groups, as well as relatively isolated huts. The center of the aggregate, or one of the commanding spots is occupied by a solid hut, large and carefully finished. The
[621] method of social and familial organization of the Sarakatsani, which
[474] consists of the Tseligato and its chief, the extended family and the
[612] conjugal family, (16)

16. See below, second part.

here also leaves its peculiar mark.

/23 cont./

361 621 474 612 The small groups correspond to the extended families, the isolated huts to conjugal families, the carefully finished hut to the chief, and the whole to the Tséligato.

[113] This organization is thus found to be engraved on the soil. (17)

17. See M. Halbwachs: Morphologie Sociale, p. 9.

233 The sheepfolds are not unusual in this respect. From their number one can deduce only the size of the flock they shelter; each contains 100 to 200 animals.

361 [116] In reality, the organization of space is much more complex. The Sarakatsani also single out evil places, others constituting the abode of supernatural beings, etc. All this will be examined in connection with the study of their magical and religious beliefs.

***

361 233 474 The encampment of our herders is called "konakia." This word, of Turkish origin, primarily means "dwelling." It is in this sense that it has been adopted into the popular language of all the inhabitants of continental Greece. However, among the Sarakatsani it also refers to the outbuildings of the dwellings, the sheepfolds and the installations for the tending of the animals in a word: the entire space they occupy.

[622] Moreover, the name of the chief of the group is added to the word "konakia"; and the different places occupied by the different groups are called "konakia of so-and-so."

The word "stani," also common to the herders of Greece, indicates the spot where the animal husbandry takes place.

Now, with respect to their referrent there is no difference between the terms "konakia" and "stani"; the nuance depends on the point of view from which one considers them: habitation in the first instance, husbandry in the second.

361 233 Finally, one finds a third term, "mandria," which /24/ designates again in general, with the cluster of shelters for the flocks. But this term should not be confused with the preceding ones, since it refers

/123 cont./

121 the other and vice versa, which any geometric figure is powerless to represent.

/124/ We use the term "conjugal family" to mean the husband and
594 wife and their non-married offspring. (1)

1. See E. Durkheim: La famille conjugale, p. 2 f.
We prefer this term to that of "elementary family"
[114] proposed by Radcliffe-Brown Introduction, p. 6, for,
as Durkheim correctly says, ibid., p. 3, the children
move away after their marriage, but the paternal
family continues to exist limited to the two spouses,
who constitute stable element which characterizes it.
The term "conjugal" is therefore more true to the facts.

596 The extended family comprises the oldest parental couple and their male descendants married and surrounded by their families. The young
[591] girls, as soon as they are married, leave the paternal hearth for the abode of their husband. That is how this type of family is born (2) and how this family becomes a patrilocal family.

2. According to A. Radcliffe-Brown: Introduction, p. 7.

591 However, it may happen, though exceptionally, that the husband of the young woman is the one to settle near his father-in-law.

474 The Tséligato is primarily a cooperative of an economic order, the
612 nucleus of which consists of an extended family, economically powerful
596 in the sense that it has at its disposal very large flocks (some of them exceed 15,000 heads of livestock). With this family a certain number of less wealthy conjugal families or extended families become associated. The associated families may be related collaterally or affinally to one another or to the principal family. However, it is equally possible that no bond of kinship unites them. In addition, it sometimes happens that shepherds without flocks attach themselves in that capacity to the Tséligato.

619 Sarakatsani society is made up of all the Sarakatsani together,

/126 cont./

582 613 182 The sociological value of this double play (expansion-constriction of kinship relations, actually social relations, between members of the same lineage by means of the marriage prohibition) resides in the fact that this system permits: first, an increase in the chances of procuring a bride belonging to the Sarakatsani milieu; second, a restoration and reinforcement of social ties which, because of a distant degree of kinship, might be loosened through a new, closer relationship.

Moreover, if the marriage between "cognates" were forbidden in perpetuity, the initial lineage would disintegrate.

602 582 Incidentally, we must emphasize that the system of kinship of the Sarakatsani is that which was adopted by Roman law. The following table (no. 1), in illustrating these remarks, shows /127/

TABLE No. 1

Obstacles to Marriage - Kinship System

EGO ♂ = ♀

Generations	Terms for vertical relationships	Terms for horizontal relationships	Terms for diagonal relationships
		Brothers	
I.	Sons	1st Cousins	Uncle 1st degree
II.	Grandsons	2nd Cousins	Uncle 2nd degree
III.	Great-grandsons	3rd Cousins	Uncle 3rd degree
IV.	Great-great grandsons		

the degrees of kinship as well as the kinship terms.

612 In other words, this is a bilateral kinship system based on consanguinity, identical with that which Western civilized society has known for a long time. (2)

2. It has its roots in Roman Law. See Digesta: Livre 38, heading 10, paragraph 10. Paulus 5, 11.

602 613 193 The Sarakatsani believe that kinship disappears beyond this eighth degree. This principle coincides with their collective family memory, and defines its limits. Madame Hadjimichali has tried to reconstruct the genealogical tree of several Sarakatsani lineages on the basis of memories of the last generation. Now these informants were able to furnish her with

/ 151 cont./

596 421 share of the fortune from their father and move away.

Now, it is unquestionable that the sons have the right to the patrimony but not the right to ownership properly speaking. Even more specifically, their rights are not "actual" or "in rem" rights; they are rather expected rights, "hopes." Since such a possibility is foreseen and accepted by Sarakatsani society, it is therefore justifiable, even with regard to the extended family of the "vertical form," to speak of "co-ownership" which, although anticipatory and potential, does not cease to be real and objectively in existence.

596 421 428 The situation becomes much clearer in the case of the extended family in the "horizontal form." It seems to us that the strategic angle which permits a grasp of this problem is that of the system of rules relating to succession, since this system appears with the death of the common father-ancestors.

In fact, when the latter disappears, the sons succeed him ab intestat /without a will/, consequently they come under the jurisdiction of the specific co-ownership set forth in the preceding section. We might say that /152/ the rule of Roman law "morte patris continuator dominium" applies here. (26)

26. See I.J. 2,19,17.-D. 38, 16.14.

596 428 Thus, the sons do not have the right to accept or refuse the inheritance. The presence of sons of the ancestor excludes the other descendants from the inheritance. This rule does not apply to the individual sons in the strict sense, but chiefly to their present or future families. (612) It is thus fundamentally a question of inheritance by kindred. (27)

27. See Radcliffe-Brown: Ibid., p. 27 "The kindred includes all the descendants of a man and his wife according to uterine and agnatic descent."

If a son, father of a family, dies before his own father, his children come into his rights and inherit the share that their father would have (171) received were he living. Let us note that this rule was already known

/152 cont./

596 428 [791] in Roman law (28) and Byzantine law, as well as in the present civil code of Greece (29) and in certain modern European codes. (30)

28. See G., c.7.8. - Ulpien: 26,2.

29. See article 1813.

30. See German code, article 1924, etc.

Daughters do not inherit. Their exclusion extends also to their offspring who have no right to the patrimony of their maternal grandfather. The inheritance concerns only the "agnates" and their personal families.

596 428 968 For her part the widow inherits nothing from her husband. However, her sons reserve for her a small share of the family fortune, not by right of inheritance, but rather out of fairness and respect--which calls to mind the fourth portion (quarta legitimae partis) of late Roman and Byzantine law in favor of the widow who is without a dowry and indigent. However, the participation of the widow in the inheritance remains, in fact, theoretical since no right of free dispostion of her share is allowed her. Upon her death her belongings, which moreover she does not [422] manage, will be handed down to her sons. However, her "paraphernalia," the trousseau which she brought along when she married belong to her "ipso jure" /by the law itself/. She may therefore dispose of this as she wishes.

596 421 428 [613] [612] The heirs do not divide "in natura" the patrimony. It is precisely here that we recognize without any question the system of co-ownership between members of the family in the "horizontal form," which, in the final analysis, concerns the sons and the beneficiary kindreds of the lineage. The patrimony remains indivisible. This does not constitute a kind of primitive communism, especially since not all the members of the family have rights of inheritance, but only certain ones. /153/ Collective ownership and ownership in common "pro parte indivisa" are clearly distinct in the sense that where co-ownership is recognized,